THE POPE AND THE CHURCH.

PRINTED BY
JAMES STANLEY, ROEHAMPTON.

THE

POPE AND THE CHURCH

CONSIDERED IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS.

BY THE

REV. PAUL BOTTALLA, S.J.,

Professor of Theology in St. Beuno's College, N. Wales.

PART II.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

LONDON:

BURNS, OATES, AND Co., 17, PORTMAN STREET.

MDCCCLXX.

PREFACE.

THE author has been hindered by the pressure of other engagements from issuing this volume as soon as he could have wished. Meantime he has had the opportunity of perusing some of the numerous works on the subject here treated which have been called out by the controversy which has of late been so active, both in England and on the Continent: and while availing himself of many valuable hints found in the publications of advocates of Papal Infallibility, he has thought it worth while to examine and answer, with some detail, the arguments brought forward by one writer on the other side. For this purpose he selected the *Concile Général* of Mgr. Maret; both because of the attention which that Prelate's position had secured for his work; and because his pages appeared to comprise all the points usually urged by Gallican theologians. The delay which has occurred has therefore helped to render the present volume more complete, and thus, it is hoped, to increase whatever value it may be found to possess.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

UNITY OF THE CHURCH AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. INFALLIBILITY OF THE JEWISH HIGH PRIEST: ITS CHARACTER.

(pp. 1—22.)

Intimate connection of the doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope with that of his Infallibility—Inconsistency of Bossuet and the Gallican School in this matter—The Pope, being the centre of unity in the Church, cannot be fallible in faith: true explanation of this principle afforded by the Fathers—Unity and Infallibility—Analogy of the Old with the New Covenant—Authority of the Jewish High Priest; his prophetical knowledge; his Infallibility in dogmatical decisions—Limitation of his Infallibility.

SECTION II.

INFALLIBILITY AND SUPREMACY. THE SAME PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE PROVE THE ONE AND THE OTHER.

(pp. 23—49.)

The Ministry of St. Peter continuing in his Successors—The words of St. Matthew xvi. 18 prove the Infallibility of the Pope no less than his supremacy—Remarks of the Fathers on this passage—The words of St. Matthew xvi. 19 prove the same—Patristic commentary on the testimony—Explanation of St. Luke xxii. 31—This text proves Papal Infallibility—Patristic commentaries—St. John xxi. 15, seq.: it bears on Papal Infallibility—Words of Bossuet on the subject—Mistaken view of Dr. Pusey on Papal Infallibility—Mgr. Maret takes the same position.

SECTION III.

PRACTICE OF ANTIQUITY CONSIDERED AS EVINCING PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

(pp. 50—71.)

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility contained in, and handed down by, the constant practice of antiquity—This follows from the necessity of communion with the Roman See—View of St. Cyprian on the subject; of Optatus of Milevis; of St. Jerome; of St. Ambrose; of St. Augustine—Pelagian controversy—Classical passage of St. Irenæus concerning the subject—Other proofs in support of our proposition—Conclusion.

SECTION IV.

INFALLIBILITY CLAIMED BY THE POPES FROM THE BEGINNING.

(pp. 72—96.)

Authority of the Popes, who have made solemn declarations on the subject—View of Innocent I. on the matter; of Pope Zosimus; of Sixtus III.; of Pope Leo I.; of Pope Simplicius; of Pope Gelasius; of Pope Hormisdas; of Pope Vigilius; of St. Gregory I.; of Pope Agatho; of Pope Leo II.—Witnesses of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility in the seventh century—View of Pope Nicholas on the subject—Other Popes claiming their Infallibility—This doctrine no speculation of modern times.

SECTION V.

THE APOSTOLIC SEE A SUPREME AND INFALLIBLE TRIBUNAL OF FAITH.

(pp. 96—114.)

False views often held by Anglicans as to the manner in which a doctrine is declared of faith—Controversies of faith have in all ages been referred to the Pope—Universal persuasion in the Church from the early times that the Apostolic See is the supreme tribunal in matters of faith—Records of embassy sent by the Martyrs of Lyons to Pope Eleutherius—Dionysius of Alexandria and Pope Sixtus II. on Rebaptism—St. Cyril and Pope Celestine on the Nestorian controversy—Theodoret and Pope Leo I. Recep-

tion of the Papal decision by the Council of Chalcedon—The Lateran Council and Martin I., and the testimony given to the prerogative of the Roman See—Theodorus the Studite—Papal decisions regarded in antiquity as exempt from further examination or doubt—The Apostolic See regarded as a supreme tribunal without appeal or control—Unfounded remarks of Mgr. Maret on the subject.

SECTION VI.

THE ROMAN PONTIFF REGARDED AS SUPREME JUDGE OF HERESY DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES. ST. CYPRIAN AND POPE STEPHEN.

(pp. 115—139.)

All final condemnations of heresies have always been pronounced by the Apostolic See--Gnosticism: its leaders condemned by the Roman Pontiffs—Montanism peremptorily declared heretical by the Papal judgment—Antitrinitarian heresies checked by the voice of the Apostolic Chair—Dionysius, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Pope Dionysius—Controversy concerning Rebaptism—St. Cyprian and the Bishops of Asia Minor in favour of that error—It is not necessary to deny the authenticity of the documents bearing on this subject—The controversy in no way affects the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, but even lends it countenance—St. Cyprian and those who agreed with him did not believe that the Pope was fallible—They regarded the whole question as one of discipline—Proofs—Had St. Cyprian and the others regarded the controversy as dogmatic, they would have implicitly denied the unity and the perpetuity of the revealed doctrine—The Decree of Pope Stephen was not a dogmatic definition—St. Cyprian and the rest resisted, because they looked on this Decree as an attempt to abolish provincial privileges—They were certainly guilty of disobedience—Explanation how St. Cyprian was able to separate the dogmatic doctrine from the disciplinary practice—Mistake of Mgr. Maret on the subject—Imprudent assertions of "Janus" on the subject.

SECTION VII.

GENERAL COUNCILS AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

(pp. 139—155.)

Mgr. Maret gives a false view of the doctrine of the Constitution of the Church and of Papal Infallibility—Papal Infallibility

is not founded on a system of isolation of the Pope from the Episcopal body—Position held by the Episcopal element in the monarchy of the Church—The Pope always acts in accordance with the Episcopal body when pronouncing his definitions—Groundless remarks of Mgr. Maret on the first Council of Jerusalem—The normal government of the Church does not rest on Ecumenical Councils—The Bishops in Council are true judges of the faith, even when the Pope has pronounced his infallible definition—There is no contradiction between Papal Infallibility and Episcopal rights in Council—The submission of the Bishops is of an entirely different nature from that of the Faithful at large.

SECTION VIII.

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. THE CASE OF POPE LIBERIUS.

(pp. 156—186.)

Ecumenical Councils a clear proof of the unity of the Church—Nature of the Arian doctrine—Convocation of the Council of Nicæa—False conception of the Gallican School as to the authority of its Decrees—The Fathers of Nicæa did no more than make a solemn act of adhesion to the teaching of the Apostolic See—Definitive sentence of Pope Dionysius on the consubstantiality of the Divine Word with the Father, long before the Council of Nicæa: it was considered as dogmatic—Arianism regarded as a heresy before the Synod on the strength of the Papal definition—The Synod followed the rule of the Apostolic See both in the controversy of Arianism and of that of Rebaptism—True object of Ecumenical Councils—The case of Liberius—In the opinion of the old Gallican School it did not affect the question of Papal Infallibility—De la Luzerne and Mr. Renouf take the contrary view—Private heresy attributed to Pope Liberius—His older and recent Apologists—Events which preceded his supposed fall—Reason for which Pope Liberius was recalled from his exile—Narrative of Sozomen concerning the document signed by Liberius at Sirmium—Even if true, it would by no means imply that the Pope fell into any heresy whatever—Sozomen's narrative in no way countenances Liberius having signed the second Arian formula of Sirmium—Philostorgius of no authority in the matter—Liberius did not sign any of the three formulas of Sirmium—The proceedings of the Council of Rimini afford a very strong

argument in his defence—The passages adduced from St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, St. Jerome, &c., are no difficulty in the way —Their explanation—The *Libellus Precum*, and blunder of Mr Renouf.

SECTION IX.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE AND THE SECOND AND THIRD ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.

(pp. 188—210.)

Liberius' sentence against the Macedonians one of the strongest proofs of Papal Infallibility—Refutation of Bossuet's remarks on this subject—Condemnation of Macedonius and Apollinaris pronounced by Pope Damasus: it is accepted everywhere as a dogmatic definition—The Council of Constantinople was not called on account of the heresies of Macedonius and Apollinaris, as Mgr. Maret asserts—The French Clergy acknowledged that the sentence of Damasus was irreversible before the Synod—Between the Second and Third Councils the Popes continued to exercise their infallible *magisterium:* their decisions against Jovinian, and the Pelagians: their sentence definitive in both the controversies—Nestorius and his heresy—St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, refers it to Pope Celestine, who condemns Nestorius definitively, should he not submit in a few days and make recantation of his errors—The Imperial *Sacra* for a General Synod did not supersede Celestine's decision—The Pope accepts the Council and delays the execution of his sentence—Old errors renewed by Mgr. Maret—Explanation of the purport of the examination of Celestine's Letter by the Council of Ephesus—The Synod declared itself necessitated by the Pope's Letter to condemn Nestorius—The Acts of the Council afford new arguments in favour of Papal Infallibility—Conclusion.

SECTION X.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE FOURTH AND FIFTH ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.

(pp. 211—246.)

Eutychianism, its origin and nature—Pope Leo's sentence is regarded as definitive by the Patriarch St. Flavian—The Pope accepts the Council called by Theodosius II. at Ephesus—His Dogmatic Letter, and his orders to his Legates show that the

Council was to adhere to his infallible sentence—Groundless objection of Mgr. Maret, already refuted by Orsi and Muzzarelli—Explanation of St. Leo's words bearing on the advantages of a General Council—Miserable result of the Synod of Ephesus—The Pope calls a new Council at Chalcedon—The Dogmatical Letter of Pope Leo was signed by the large majority of the Bishops before the meeting of the Council, and that in order to comply with the orders of the Pope—Mgr. Maret's contrary assertions are baseless—Leo's Letter a rule of faith before the Decree of the Synod of Chalcedon—Proofs derived from the Acts of the Council against the views of Mgr. Maret and his School—The examination of St. Leo's Letter in the Council does not prove that it was held to be reformable—Refutation of the remarks made by Mgr. Maret on the formula used by the Council when signing St. Leo's Letter—A passing remark on Pope Hormisdas' formulary—Controversy of the Three Chapters—Prudent conduct of Pope Vigilius acknowledged by De Marca himself—The character of the controversy: it by no means concerned the faith—The *Judicatum* of Pope Vigilius—Economical reasons for which he recalled the *Judicatum* and referred the whole matter to a Council—Despotical interference of the Emperor Justinian—Illegality of the Synod—*Constitutum* of the Pope—It contains no error in faith—The many blunders of Mgr. Maret in this matter—Nor did the Pope speak *ex cathedrâ* in the *Constitutum*—The *Constitutum* was not communicated to the Council, as Mgr. Maret asserts: therefore the Fifth Synod did not pass over it—Even in that Synod the Fathers intended to adhere to the Pope's views—Final Acts of Pope Vigilius in confirmation of the Decrees of the Fifth Synod—Faith was not concerned in any part of those proceedings.

SECTION XI.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE SIXTH COUNCIL. CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS.

(pp. 247—284.)

Monothelism: its nature—The successors of Honorius I. condemn it definitively: their Decrees were received as dogmatic—Refutation of the reasons alleged by Mgr. Maret and his School against this assertion—Pope Agatho's view regarding the new Council proposed by the Emperor: instructions received by his Legates—Dogmatic Letters of Pope Agatho read in the Sixth Council: he maintains in them the Infallibility of the Apostolic

See—Defence of the passages bearing on Papal Infallibility, against Mr. Renouf's remarks (in the note)—The Synod received them as a whole and in all their points—That they were examined is no objection against our position—Condemnation of Pope Honorius—Different lines of argument taken by the Catholics in the matter—Threefold question on the subject—Pope Honorius' Letters were not utterances *ex cathedrâ*—Their doctrine is orthodox—Twofold explanation of the principal passage objected to by the Monothelites—The Synod cannot have condemned him for error *ex cathedrâ*—The sense in which the Council did condemn him is to be taken from the Letters of Pope Leo II.—The fault of Honorius, as stated in St. Leo's Letters, is neglect in the discharge of his Pontifical duties—Full explanation of Pope Leo's Letter to Constantine—His Letters to the Bishops of Spain and to King Ervigius — The *Liber Diurnus* — Condemnation of Honorius renewed by the Seventh and Eighth Councils—Passage of the old Breviary mentioning his condemnation—Conclusion.

SECTION XII.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH GENERAL COUNCILS.

(pp. 285—310.)

Heresy and persecution of the Iconoclasts—The error definitively condemned by six Popes—General Synod of Nicæa II., assembled only to conquer the obstinacy of the heretics—The Synod acknowledged the doctrine of the worship of the images of Saints to be of faith before their meeting — Testimony of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople—The difficulty which the Seventh Council met with in France is no argument against Papal Infallibility — Patriarch Nicephorus and Theodore the Studite in favour of Papal Infallibility—Photius' usurpation and deposition—Council of Constantinople—Formula of faith imposed by Pope Hadrian I. on the Eighth Council, and accepted without examination : it is an argument for Papal superiority to Councils and infallibility—Letters of Pope Nicholas and Hadrian II. read in the Synod and adhered to by the Fathers : they contained doctrines bearing on Papal superiority to Councils and irreformability of judgment—The Council exercised no jurisdiction over the judicial sentence passed by the Pope against Photius—The Council, by condemning Photius, literally executed the sentence of the Pope—Conclusion.

SECTION XIII.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY FROM THE EIGHTH TO THE SIXTEENTH COUNCIL. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

(pp. 311—341.)

The first three Lateran Councils concerned matters of discipline —Still, during that time heresies are definitively condemned by the Popes alone—Heresy of Berengarius condemned by several Popes—Doctrine of St. Gregory VII. on Papal superiority and Infallibility: it is the doctrine of antiquity and of his own age—Heresy of Abelard condemned by Innocent II. without any General Council —His condemnation an evident utterance *ex cathedrâ*—Heresy of Gilbert de la Porrée condemned by Eugenius III. without any Ecumenical Council—Historical blunders of Mr. Renouf in the matter (in the note)—The doctrine of Papal Infallibility known in the East in the twelfth century—Fourth Lateran Council—The second Council of Lyons—Formula of faith sent by Clement IV. and Gregory X. to the Eastern Church to be signed previously to the meeting of the Synod, and without reserve—It is an evident proof of Papal Infallibility—The Decrees sanctioned in the Council—Council of Vienne—Its Bull of Convocation expresses the doctrine of Papal Infallibility—The Constitution *De Summa Trinitate et de Fide Catholica*—Useless evasions of Mgr. Maret and his School—Gross blunder of Mgr. Maret—Development of the doctrine on Papal Infallibility: its different stages—Conjectures of "Janus" on the subject—External causes of the scientific development of the doctrine—True view and origin of Scholastic Theology—St. Anselm, the first of the Schoolmen, believed in the Papal Infallibility—Doctrine of Albert the Great on Papal Infallibility, of St. Thomas, of St. Bonaventure—Evident testimonies of the French Church and the fourteenth century in favour of Papal Infallibility—It was the doctrine of the Universal Church.

SECTION XIV.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AT THE TIME OF THE COUNCILS OF CONSTANCE AND FLORENCE. GALLICANISM.

(pp. 342—379.)

Origin and beginning of the error on Papal Infallibility and the superiority of the General Council—The Synods of Pisa and Constance, before the election of Martin V., were not Ecumenical

Councils — Refutation of Mgr. Maret's assertion concerning the ecumenical character of the first Sessions of Constance—The Acts of the Council and of Martin V. show in which sense the Constitutions of the Fifth Session should be taken—The Decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Basle did not receive any additional authority by being confirmed by that Synod—That Synod was not canonical even after the Bull *Dudum*—Eugenius IV. never gave the least approval to the Decrees sanctioned at Basle on Papal authority—The Pope not only did not sin in faith by condemning the Synod of Basle and afterwards declaring it legitimate, but he was not guilty of any self-contradiction—Wrong conception of the Infallibility of a General Council held by Mgr. Maret—Council of Florence: its Decree on Papal authority — False interpretation of that Decree given by Mgr. Maret and the Gallican School: its illegality—The clause of the Decree—Dr. Döllinger's blunder—Its true meaning countenanced by the Acts of the Council—After the Council of Florence the doctrine on Papal Infallibility again became universal—Bull of Pius II.—Condemnation of Peter of Osma by Sixtus IV.—Council of Lateran—Acts and Decrees of Leo X. in favour of Papal Infallibility and superiority to General Councils — Constitution of Paul IV. against the Socinians—Errors of Baius condemned by Pius V. and Gregory XIII.—All submit to that condemnation—Jansenism — Its condemnation rests on the Infallibility of the Pope—Sentiments expressed by the French Clergy in a letter to Innocent X.—Other letters to the same and to Alexander VIII. in favour of Papal Infallibility—Universality of this doctrine in the Church down to 1663—True origin of Gallicanism—Assembly of 1682 in France: its real nature—Its Decree condemned on all hands, even by the University of Paris—Violence employed to secure the adoption of the proposition denying Papal Infallibility —Sentence of the Apostolic See against the Declaration of 1682—Submission of the French Clergy and of the King.

SECTION XV.

DOGMATIC CHARACTER OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. ITS OBJECT AND ITS CONDITIONS.

(pp. 380—394.)

No particular censure inflicted by the Holy See on the French Declaration of 1682; nevertheless, it was fully condemned by the Pope—The doctrine of Papal Infallibility, even before its definition,

is to be held as *de fide divinâ*—To deny it would be to deny a truth contained in the *Deposit;* therefore, to do so would be in itself a heresy—But to deny it under the forms condemned by Sixtus IV. and Leo X. would be a formal heresy, in opposition to a Catholic truth defined by the Church—Meaning of the Decrees published in 1831 by the Penitentiaria—Object of Papal Infallibility identical with that of Church Infallibility—Conditions of Papal Infallibility —Meaning of utterances being *ex cathedrâ:* they do not depend upon any external forms either of the Papal Letters or of other disciplinary circumstances — Nature and true idea of Papal Infallibility—The Church has means of verification in case of doubt whether the Pope has spoken *ex cathedrâ*—Holiness no necessary condition of Infallibility, as Mgr. Maret supposes—Difference between the two *charismata*—Conclusion—Recapitulation of the whole volume.

THE

INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

SECTION I.

UNITY OF THE CHURCH AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. INFALLIBILITY OF THE JEWISH HIGH PRIEST: ITS CHARACTER.

So intimate is the connection subsisting between the doctrine of Papal Infallibility and the constitution of the Church, that to form a complete view of the latter which shall exclude the former is now logically impossible. This was not so in former times, when controversy had not yet developed the true position of the doctrine in question; and it was once quite possible to fail to perceive the existence of any link whatever between the Primacy and the Infallibility of the Popes. A Catholic who admitted the Primacy, might disregard, or even reject the Infallibility; he might excusably look upon the opinion which made the Pope infallible in the Church as a mere system invented by some private theologians, but devoid of foundation in revelation. Passion and prejudice would for a while draw the minds of many in this direction, and they would be led to take up a partial and false view of the Primacy itself. But passions are quenched by time, and prejudices are dispelled. As might have been anticipated, a sure process of development began; logic and hermeneutic science did their work, the true aspects of the Catholic

doctrine of the Supremacy were discerned, and among these, its essential character of infallibility in teaching. What we have said may serve as a sketch of the course run by the Gallican party, which, by favour of the civil power, for some time exerted much influence in Catholic France. In the seventh section of the first part of this work, the rise of the Gallican party is described, and it is shown that it was from the hands of the ministers of the King that the assembled Prelates received the Four Articles of the famous Declaration of 1682. These Articles were in open opposition to the tradition of the Church of France, no less than to that of the Universal Church; but they were also opposed to all sound logic, admitting as they did a supremacy in the Pope at the same time that they held him liable to error in matters of faith. This inconsistency could not escape the clear sight of Bossuet; in his conscience he must have rejected this fundamental doctrine of Gallicanism, but led by human considerations he consented to become the advocate of a system which in his heart he condemned. Therefore, "in order to make what he owed to conscience," says De Maistre, "agree with what he thought he owed to other considerations, he clung with all his might to the celebrated but vain distinction of the Chair and the Person."[1] The distinction of the Chair and the Person is indeed vain and frivolous; it is hard to understand how the great mind of Bossuet could have embraced such a theory,[2] or how he could have hoped to gain for it acceptance by others. He taught that the whole line of Roman Pontiffs must be considered as forming a continuance of the one person of St. Peter, in whom the faith can never wholly fail; it

[1] Count de Maistre, *The Pope*, bk. i., ch. xi., p. 55. Translation of Rev. Æ. Mc. D. Dawson. London, 1850.

[2] *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xv., cap. v., p. 334. Edit. Basileæ.

might fail partially, and in fact had so failed by the lapse of individual Popes, but it would speedily rise from its fall.[3] It is probable that these sophistical subtleties were far from commanding any wide assent even among the adherents of Gallicanism. The inconsistency of the position taken up by Bossuet was pointed out in the Assembly of 1682 by the Bishop of Tournay, who with much vigour urged that the indefectibility of the Chair involved logically the infallibility of the Person.[4] This was a weighty argument; and in the same Assembly Bossuet met it by answers which were powerless to give satisfaction to his mind, while they reveal the extent of his embarrassment. The mind of Fénélon was more consistent than that of his great rival, and less under the dominion of prejudice; he saw clearly that the position taken up by the Bishop of Tournay remained unassailed, and in his work on the authority of the Pope, he had no difficulty in showing the futility of the attempt at reply made by Bossuet.[5] But we are not now concerned with Bossuet's arguments in support of his case. In the fact that a man of his genius should have felt himself constrained to countenance a distinction so untenable, we have a clear proof that he felt how essential was the connection between the union and indefectibility of the Church of Christ and the existence in it of some infallible centre.

In the preceding portion of this work we developed the argument proving that Catholic unity is Roman unity; we showed that Catholic unity rests on the

[3] L. c. "Accipiendi RR. PP. tanquam una persona Petri, in qua nunquam fides penitus deficiat," &c.

[4] Fénélon, *De Auctoritate Summi Pontificis*, cap. vii. (Ouvrages, t. ii., p. 270, seq. Edit. Versailles, 1820). See it also in Fleury, *Nouveaux Opuscules* (Paris, 1818); *Anecdotes sur l'Assemblée de* 1682, p. 218, seq.; Gérin, *Rech. Hist.*, &c., ch. vii., p. 295, seq. (Paris, 1869).

[5] Op. cit., capp. viii., ix., p. 274, seq.

supreme authority of the Pope, who is the centre of the Church, giving it substantial unity and real indefectibility; so that these two essential properties of the Church must be abandoned by all those who repudiate the Papal Supremacy. We now proceed to demonstrate the converse proposition, showing that by a logical and hermeneutical necessity, the admission of the unity and indefectibility instituted by Christ in the Church leads to the admission of Papal Infallibility. This being shown, it will follow that the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope is essential to the very idea of the Church. The question is no mere scholastic dispute, nor can they who maintain the affirmative be charged with seeking to impose upon the world their own private theological system as being revealed doctrine. The truth of what we here assert will be clearly seen by the aid of the following considerations.

It is admitted by all Catholics that the Pope is the centre of unity in the Church; the station of the Bishops is on the circumference of the circle, the centre is occupied by the Pope alone. Each separate diocese receives substantial unity from its Bishop, the Pope gives substantial unity to the Universal Church. This is the doctrine of antiquity, and it is the plain teaching of St. Cyprian. Now, Catholic unity rests on unity of faith, for the Church rests on faith, and cannot be One unless faith is one. But the faith which is to be the basis of unity cannot be the mere interior belief of Christians; the visible Church must have a visible unity of faith founded on the oneness of the visible, external profession made by believers. Hence we are led to the conclusion that the Pope is the centre of the external profession of the Catholic faith. If then the Pope is fallible in his dogmatic definitions, the profession of faith in the Church rests on a frail foundation; her unity is liable to be broken, and she is devoid of that

perfect oneness which Christ established in her after the pattern of the Holy Trinity. A Pontiff subject to fall into error and heresy cannot be the divinely appointed centre of Catholic unity. It is impossible to admit the doctrine of Papal Supremacy as it is admitted by all Catholics, and at the same time reject the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. The logical bond between these dogmas is close, and the two cannot be severed. There is more real consistency in the systems of Protestant writers who reject the Supremacy of the Pope altogether, than in those of the old Gallicans and of the Catholics who following the modern liberal positive School, aim at reconciling the admission of the Supremacy with the denial of the doctrinal Infallibility.

Another proof of what is here said may be derived from the duty of each among the Faithful to submit to the Pope and to the Bishop of his own diocese. The duty of all Christians to submit themselves to the authority of the Pope is an immediate result of the sovereignty divinely conferred upon him in the Church. Protestantism, it is true, wrested this sovereign power from the Pope, and conferred it upon the Church—or rather, upon the people at large, the members of the Church. The world owes to Protestantism the first introduction of the idea of the supremacy of the people, which was applied in the first instance to ecclesiastical affairs; after the lapse of two centuries it was transferred to civil society, and is now producing its natural fruits in all the countries of Christendom. But this sovereignty of the people was introduced into the Church by the Reformers, in defiance of the teachings of antiquity and the institution of Christ. The divinely appointed form of government in the Church is a monarchy, admitting no admixture of democratic influence. The sovereignty resides in the Roman Pontiff, the Successor of St. Peter; while at the same time a share of the sovereign power is

exercised by each Bishop in his own diocese. But each one of the Bishops holds his power in subjection to the control of the superior sovereign who has his See at Rome, and who owes subjection to no earthly power, but to Christ alone. Hence we see the force of the maxim which gives brief expression to the persuasion and practice of all antiquity—*Prima sedes a nemine judicatur.* In this, and in no other sense, it has been said by some theologians that the monarchy of the Pope in the Church is tempered by something of aristocracy.[6] How implicit a submission the people are bound to render to their Bishops we gather from the expressions of the holy Martyr St. Ignatius, the disciple of the Apostles, and the successor of St. Peter in the See of Antioch. Thus, he says that all the Faithful are bound to concur perfectly with the mind of their Bishop;[7] that they ought to be one and the same mind with him;[8] that they should agree with him in order to possess the type and doctrine of incorruption;[9] that they should follow their Bishop as Christ followed His Father.[10] St. Ignatius assigns a reason for this duty of submission; for the Bishops express the mind of Christ, as Christ expresses the mind of His Father,[11] so that he who refuses submission to the Bishop, refuses

[6] See Bellarmine, *De Summo Pontifice*, l. i., capp. v., viii., ix. (Op., t. i., pp. 458, 466, 469. Edit. Rom., 1832).

[7] "Decet vos concurrere Episcopi sententiæ" (γνώμῃ). *Ad Ephes.*, cap. iv., p. 273. Edit. Jacobson.

[8] "In idipsum . . . unus intellectus" (εἷς νοῦς). *Ad Magnesianos*, cap. vii., p. 317.

[9] "Unanimi Episcopo et præsidentibus in typum et doctrinam incorruptionis" (l. c., cap. vi.).

[10] "Omnes Episcopum sequimini ut Jesus Christus Patrem" (*Ad Smyrnæos*, cap. viii., p. 431).

[11] Ἰησοῦς γὰρ Χριστὸς . . . Πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσίν (*Ad Eph.*, cap. iii., pp. 270—272).

submission to Christ Himself. The teaching of all antiquity agrees with the doctrine which we have here adduced from St. Ignatius. By the fundamental constitution of the Church the Faithful are not only bound to render obedience to their Bishop in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, but also to accept and believe the doctrine which they receive from his mouth no otherwise than if it came from the mouth of Christ Himself. It does not follow from this that infallibility belongs to each individual Bishop; far from it. Each Bishop is subject to, and dependent on, the supreme central sovereign power of the Pope. Should any Bishop set himself up against the Papal authority, should he refuse to accept the Papal definitions of doctrine, he would no longer be a legitimate Bishop, but would become a rebel; far from representing Christ, he would be waging war against Christ, and tearing His mystical Body. He would justly lose the authority that he had previously enjoyed, for he would have withdrawn himself from subjection to that sovereign power which is the centre of faith and of all unity in the Church, and would have endeavoured to set up in his own person another chair and another sovereign power in opposition to that one which has the sanction of Christ Himself. The test of the orthodoxy of a doctrine taught by a Bishop is to be found in his adhesion to the Roman Pontiff and in conformity with him. This is the one condition, necessary and sufficient, to enable him to be called the *mind* of Christ; to allow it to be said that he hands down the type and doctrine of incorruption; on this condition, and on this condition only, the Faithful are bound to be in perfect accordance with their Bishop. Or we may put the same argument in a slightly different form. The people of each diocese submit to the dogmatical teaching of their Bishop because they acknowledge it to be the infallible teaching

of the Church of Christ; but they need a test to assure them that they are not deceived, and their one sufficient unequivocal test is found in the adherence of their Bishop to the *magisterium* of the Roman Pontiff. The doctrinal teaching of the Roman Pontiff must evidently therefore be infallible, for the reliability of the teaching of each Bishop is, in the economy of the Church, no more than a rill derived from the stream of the Papal *magisterium*, a reverberation from the voice of the Pope; at the same time that the Papal Infallibility is not, any more than the infallibility of the living Church itself, reduced to the unity of a single teacher. If we conceive the Pope destitute of this divine privilege, his claim to sovereignty is lost, the constitution of the Church is changed, and of a monarchy it becomes an episcopal aristocracy. The Bishops, and not the Pope, would possess the supreme authority; the Pope's Supremacy would be lost, and the Bishop of Rome reduced to an equality of rank with other Bishops. He would be liable to account for his own doctrine to the Episcopate, to receive their definitions of faith, and to make their teaching the pattern of his own. The absurdity of these results is visible to all who understand the nature of the government established by Christ for the guidance of His Church.

Again, Catholics of every School agree in considering the Roman Pontiff as the foundation-stone of the Church; and here we must understand by the Church not merely an organised society of men, but a society making open profession of a particular faith. Hence it follows that the Roman Pontiff, or rather the faith publicly professed by the Roman Pontiff, is the foundation-stone of the faith publicly professed in and by the Church. But the faith of the Church, which is indefectible, cannot rest on a defectible basis — the building must follow the nature of the foundation. It

the Roman Pontiff, the foundation-stone of the faith of the Church, fall into error or heresy, either the Church must fail, or it must be displaced from its original foundation. But those with whom we are arguing admit that the Church cannot fail, nor the faith taught in and by the Church, and that to be built on the rock of Peter is among the essential unchanging characters of the Church. If it be possible for the Pope to err when teaching the Church, to adulterate the pure faith of Christ with falsehood, there must be a right in the Church to resist, to reject his definitions, to decline submission to the laws which he enacts. And this power could not be exercised by the whole body of the Faithful, for Christ never intrusted to the people any share of authority in the government of the Church, nor gave them any power to teach; their duty is to listen and submit. Nor can it be said that the power to judge the Papal definitions resides in the general assembly of Bishops, for on this theory, until a universal meeting of the whole Catholic Episcopate was held, the faith of the Church would be resting on the insecure foundation of error or heresy; and the Bishops in Synod assembled, who possess and exercise the power of discussing, and, if need be, condemning and rejecting the doctrine proposed by the Pope, would themselves form the foundation-stone on which the faith would rest. And, since the assembling of the Bishops is no ordinary occurrence in the Church, but an extraordinary measure reserved for extraordinary occasions, it follows that the Church in its normal state would have no firm foundation whatever; it would have merely a false appearance of being based on the Supremacy of the Successor of St. Peter. We are forced, therefore, to the conclusion that the admission of the character of foundation as belonging to the Roman Pontiff logically involves the admission of his infallibility, and that they who recog-

nise the one prerogative cannot in consistency reject the other. Yet such is the self-contradictory position taken up by the Gallican party of old, and by their representatives, the minimisers of our own day; who acknowledge that the Church is truly built on the rock of St. Peter, and that the line of the Bishops of Rome are the true heirs of the Prince of the Apostles, and successors to his authority, and yet venture to call in question or deny the Papal Infallibility, and pretend that an appeal lies from the decision of a Pope to that of a future Council of Bishops.[12] The Jansenists did not omit to seek support for their cause in so-called Gallican liberties. When their doctrine was condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus* (1713), they replied by a solemn appeal to a future General Council, and France and all Europe were filled with their scandalous protests.[13] Not only is it untrue in fact that Christ instituted His Church in accordance with the Gallican theories, but He could not have so instituted it without Himself placing in it a germ which would surely destroy all visible unity. In the first section of the first part of this work we have proved to demonstration that Christ established in His Church the most perfect unity, and that He rested this unity on the Papal Supremacy; so that, if the matter be looked at aright, the visible unity of the Church and the Papal Supremacy are not two distinct institutions united merely by an external bond

[12] Fleury, *Opuscules. Discours sur les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*, p. 131. Edit. Paris, 1818. "Nous croyons qu'il est permis d'appeler du Pape au futur Concile."

[13] Pope Clement XI., by his Bull *Pastoralis Officii* (1718), condemned the *Appellantes*, and declared them excommunicate unless they submitted without delay to the Bull *Unigenitus*. The greater number complied with his order, especially after the submission of Cardinal de Noailles. See Rohrbacher, *Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise*, l. 88, t. xxvi., p. 421, seq. Paris, 1848.

of connection, but they are different aspects of one and the same thing; the perfect visible unity which is a property of the Church is the unity which arises from the Papal Supremacy, and Papal Supremacy cannot exist apart from the most perfect visible unity. If this be true—if Papal Supremacy and Church unity are not really distinct, but are one institution, identically the same but receiving different names, expressive of the different modes in which it may be viewed—it clearly follows that the same perfection and the same degree of perfection must necessarily be found in each. Now we have seen that the unity with which Christ endowed His Church consists partly in the perfect oneness of the external profession of faith made by all her members; and a central authority which was fallible, which could by possibility err in definitions of faith, would be powerless to secure such oneness of external profession—this oneness must be based on the absolute infallible truth of the doctrine proposed. It follows, therefore, that the Infallibility of the Pope in his dogmatic definitions is necessarily implied in the very constitution of the Church. To hold otherwise is to misapprehend the very nature and purpose of Church unity.

The argument just given seems to be conclusive, and to admit of no valid answer on the part of a disputant who maintains the perfect visible unity of the Church. However, in matters of this nature it is important not to be content with theological reasoning, but to listen to the teaching of the Word of God, written in the Holy Scriptures or preserved in the tradition of the Church. This teaching is in perfect accordance with the doctrine we maintain. We will endeavour to show that every single passage in the Gospels in which reference is made to the primacy of St. Peter implies also his infallibility and that of his Successors; and that the same doctrine is taught in the works of the Fathers, and in all the other

records of the faith and practice of the Church in every age. But before we enter on the discussion of the passages of the New Testament bearing upon the subject, it seems well to give a glance at the economy of the old Mosaic dispensation, and to inquire into the authority possessed by the Jewish High Priest in his capacity of President of the Supreme Council, and into the credit due to definitive judgments proceeding from him.

This inquiry into the organisation of the Jewish Church will not be without value to prepare the reader and show him what institutions he may expect to find established in the Church of Christ. The older dispensation was a figure of the new; that was the shadow, this the reality; that was the promise, this the performance; that was the type, and this the anti-type and fulfilment. The economy of redemption, as exhibited in the two Testaments, is one and the same, and complete agreement and harmony exists between them. Each mystery of the Christian religion and each institution in the Church of Christ is typified in the religious history and institutions of the chosen people, and a perfect analogy may be recognised between the type and the anti-type. The New Testament, it is true, excels the perfection of the Old Testament, as the reality excels the shadow, as the law of freedom, love, and life is more excellent than the law of bondage, fear, and death. From this difference we gather that the occurrence of any want of perfection in the elder economy by no means implies the existence of the like want in the new; but whatever perfection we find in the Old Testament will assuredly not be wanting in that which is the fulfilment of its promises. After these preliminary remarks we may enter on our inquiry.

The High Priest was, by divine institution, the supreme head of the Jewish Church. He held the

commission from God to be the interpreter of the Law and the absolute judge of controversies, from whose sentence there lay no appeal. The Church of the old dispensation was co-extensive with the Israelitish state, the people of which were the peculiar possession of God, consecrated to Him in the person of the High Priest. God Himself was the true King of Israel, exercising His sway through the Law which manifested the true theocratic nature of the polity, and which, pervading the details of life among the people, whether considered as individuals or in their domestic and social relations, moulded all, and gave to every act a religious character.[14] The Kings who were to rule over God's people had no function but that of military leaders, bound, by using the power of the sword, to uphold and protect the observance of the Law; the interpretation of the Mosaic Code was reserved to the High Priest alone. This does not exclude the existence of royal judges, charged with the decision of questions of civil right, and we read of such in the days of King Josaphat (2 Paralip. xix. 5), but questions touching religion were reserved to the tribunal of the High Priest alone, by whose decision even the Kings were bound.[15] This point is put beyond all doubt by the express words of the Law:[16] "If thou perceive that there be among you

[14] See on this matter Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. ii., bk. x., n. ii., 1, p. 335, seq. London, 1862.

[15] See Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicæ*, l. iv., cap. viii., n. 17 (Op., t. i., p. 164. Oxonii).

[16] Deut. xvii. 8—12. "If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment between blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosy and leprosy: and thou see that the words of the judges within thy gates do vary: arise, and go up to the place, which the Lord thy God shall choose. And thou shalt come to the Priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge, that shall be at that time: and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall show thee the truth of the judgment. And thou shalt do whatso-

a hard and doubtful matter, &c., thou shalt come to the Priests of the Levitical race and to the judge that shall be at that time." Jewish and Christian commentators agree in referring this passage to the High Priest,[17] and the same interpretation is recognised by Josephus,[18] and by Philo;[19] so that Protestant Divines, both of the earlier and more modern Schools, agree in ascribing to the High Priest the function of giving authoritative decisions of whatever doubts arose as to the true meaning of the Law. This authority comprehended all matters to which the Law in any manner applied; questions of faith and religion were far from being excluded, and formed in fact, the primary subject of the pontifical utterances; and questions "concerning the Commandments, the ceremonies, the justifications" are mentioned in the Second Book of Paralipomenon as being the proper subject coming under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council or Sanhedrim, of which the president was the High Priest himself;[20] and in the same chapter[21] a

ever they shall say, that preside in the place, which the Lord shall choose, and what they shall teach thee, according to His law; and thou shalt follow their sentence: neither shalt thou decline to the right hand nor to the left hand. But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the Priest who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel."

[17] See the *Targum of Palestine*, sec. xlviii., and the *Targum of Onkelos*, sec. xlviii.; *The Targums*, vol. ii., pp. 611, 514 (Translation of J. W. Etheridge. London, 1865); Bonfrerius, *Pentateuchus Moysis Comm. illustratus*, p. 971, seq. Ad locum Deut. xvii. 9.

[18] Josephus, l. ii., *Contra Appionem*, n. 21, p. 1379 (Op., t. ii. Oxonii), et l. iv., *Antiquit. Jud.*, n. 14, p. 163 (Op., t. i.).

[19] Philo Jud., *De Creatione Principis*, p. 457. Basileæ, 1554.

[20] 2 Paralipom. xix. 9, &c.

[21] 2 Paralipom. xix. 11. "Amarias the Priest, your High Priest, shall be chief in the things which regard God: and Zabadias the son of Ismahel, who is ruler in the house of Juda, shall be over those matters which belong to the king's office."

clear line of demarcation is drawn between matters which belonged to the sacerdotal tribunal and those which might be fitly dealt with by a royal official.

We now come to consider how far an infallible character belonged to the definitive solutions of questions of faith given from time to time by the High Priest down to the epoch when the Synagogue ceased to be the true Church of God on earth. It cannot be doubted that God granted to the High Priest some peculiar kind of prophetical knowledge, nor need we stay to inquire whether he ever prophesied by virtue of some internal inspiration, or whether he was indebted for all his supernatural knowledge to the varying appearance of the Urim and Thummim, or stones of the breast-plate, to which God had been pleased to communicate a peculiar virtue.[22] Whatever was the precise mode in which the gift was communicated, we are assured of its existence; some gift of prophecy was certainly granted by God to the Jewish High Priest in virtue of his sacerdotal character. We find proof of this in St. Cyril,[23] St. Chrysostom,[24] St. Augustine,[25] and many others of the Fathers of the Church, and the High Priest is expressly termed a Prophet both by Josephus and by Philo in the places lately cited. The matter is put beyond all doubt by the words in the Gospel of St. John with reference

[22] What the Urim and Thummin really were, and in what manner responses were obtained, the Scripture does not say; and interpreters render those terms variously. Mr. Etheridge gives a short essay upon those various translations in his "Glossary of Hieratic and Legal terms in the Pentateuch," printed in the second volume of the *Targums*, p. 43, seq.

[23] S. Cyrillus, l. vii. et viii., *In Joan. Evang. Fragmenta*, ad Joan. xi. 51 (Op., t. vii., p. 69. Edit. Migne).

[24] S. Chrysostomus, *Hom.* lxv., *in Joan.*, n. 1 (Op., t. viii., p. 362. Edit. Migne).

[25] S. Augustinus, *Tract.* xlix., *in Joan. Evang.*, cap. xi., n. 27 (Op., t. iii., p. 1757. Edit. Migne).

to Caiaphas, "the High Priest of that year."[26] The Evangelist records the saying that "it was expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not," and then goes on: "This he spoke not of himself, but being the High Priest of that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation."[27] The Fathers, including those above referred to,[28] agree in this view of the meaning of St. John's words, and they remark upon the low state to which the Priestly office had sunk now that its holder was a mere puppet in the hands of the lieutenant of a foreign power. "Nevertheless," as St. Chrysostom remarks, "the Holy Ghost was still with the Priesthood,"[29] and he goes on: "Grace used the mouth only of Caiaphas, and did not touch his impure heart."[30] It is observed by St. Augustine and St. Cyril that the gift belonged to the divine Sacrament and unction of the office of High Priest,[31] being conferred by God as a help in the work of governing the Jewish Church.

It must not be supposed, from what has been said, that the Fathers attributed to the High Priest, in virtue of his office, any portion of prophetical inspiration properly so called. The responses which were granted by God

[26] "Potest movere quomodo dicatur Pontifex anni illius, cum Deus unum constituerit summum Sacerdotem, cui mortuo unus succederet. Sed intelligendum est per ambitiones et contentiones inter Judæos postea constitutum ut plures essent et per annos singulos vicibus ministrarent" (S. Augustinus, l. c.).

[27] Joan. xi. 50, 51.

[28] Ll. cc.

[29] Πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτω παρῆν ἔτι τὸ Πνεῦμα (S. Chrysost., l. c., p. 361).

[30] καὶ τῷ στόματι μόνον ἐκέχρητο ἡ χάρις, τῆς δὲ μιαρᾶς καρδίας οὐχ ἥψατο (S. Chrysost., l. c.).

[31] "Quod tamen Evangelista divino tribuit Sacramento quia Pontifex fuit, idest, Summus Sacerdos" (S. Aug., l. c.); χρίσματι (S. Cyril., l. c.).

by means of the Urim and Thummim were certainly of a nature different from that special divine influence which constitutes the gift of prophecy; and we learn from Josephus that at one period, on account of God's anger at the sins of His people, the brightening of the stones which composed the breast-plate ceased for two hundred years together.[32] It is clear, then, that the oracle of the breast-plate was intended only as an instrument used by God in carrying out the theocratic government of His people, and that it did not form any essential part of the religious polity of the Jews considered as a Church; and as at one time the responses ceased to be given, the right of them cannot have belonged to the High Priest in virtue of his office. Nor do the expressions used by the Fathers, either in commenting on the passage in St. John or elsewhere, imply that a prophecy in the strict meaning of the term was uttered by Caiaphas. Prophecy may be considered in its principle or in its object. The object of prophecy must be something future; its principle must be an illumination granted by God to the human understanding, whereby something becomes known, the knowledge of which could not naturally be attained. Applying this to the case of Caiaphas, we see that the object of his utterance was future, namely, the great work of the redemption of mankind which Christ was about to perform. So far, then, it might be said that Caiaphas prophesied, but the principle of prophecy was wanting, for St. Cyril and the other Fathers expressly state that the prophetical spirit was wanting to him; yet they say that he spoke by virtue of his pontifical unction, and that on account of this unction the Holy Ghost was with him, and put a thought into his mind and words into his mouth, of the prophetical import of

[32] Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicæ*, l. iii., cap. viii., n. 9, p. 120 (Op., t. i. Edit. Oxonii).

which he was entirely ignorant.[33] We conclude, therefore, that, according to the teaching of the Fathers, the High Priest received a certain special assistance of the Holy Spirit as a prerogative of his office, which assistance was therefore with him when he gave his dogmatic decisions concerning the true meaning of Revelation. This is the doctrine of the infallibility of the High Priest among the Jews.

The doctrine may be proved directly from the writings of the Old Law. In the passage which we cited above from Deuteronomy, it is ordained that recourse should be had to the High Priest as often as any doctrinal controversy arose. All were bound to submit to his decision, and the Divine Lawgiver decreed the penalty of death against all who should refuse to submit themselves to this supreme authority. This rigorous legislation is inconsistent with the belief that the High Priest was liable to err in his decisions. It is conceivable that the decisions of a supreme tribunal should be made binding on all, although by possibility erroneous, when the question concerned nothing but rights of property or even questions of exterior religious discipline, and it might be well that the penalty of death should be denounced against the contumacious, but the case is very different where doctrinal decisions are concerned. To insist on exterior submission to the *dogmatic* decrees of a judge who is not recognised as infallible, is to force men to express externally their belief in that which at the same time they are at liberty to disbelieve in their hearts. If the High Priest were fallible, every Jew was liable to be forced, under threat of death, to declare his assent to false religious doctrine, and to conform his religious practice to this falsehood. Such cannot have been the order established by God. He must have required from His people interior belief of

[33] S. Cyrillus, l. c.; S. Chrysost., l. c.; S. Aug., l. c.; &c.

whatever doctrine came to them with the authority of their supreme teacher; and, as God cannot have commanded the interior belief of falsehood, we have in this command a pledge that God was with His minister, guarding him from error in his doctrinal decisions. That must be pure unsullied truth which man is bound to believe by the strict and absolute command of Him Who is the increate Truth. Therefore we conclude that, so long as the sentence pronounced by the High Priest concerned civil and disciplinary matters, it rested only on his experience and prudence; but when it regarded definitions in religious doctrines it was delivered under the assistance of the Holy Ghost.

We are glad to observe that a recent English Protestant writer holds the same doctrine. Mr. Etheridge, in the Glossary appended to his translation of the *Targums*, remarks that "among the typical persons of the Old Testament, the High Priest stands pre-eminent as . . . the infallible counsellor, with whom is the oracle of God."[34]

Let us now consider the state of things under the New Law. "As soon," says St. Chrysostom, "as the High Priests of the Old Testament lifted up their hands against Christ, the Holy Ghost abandoned them and passed over to the Apostles."[35] The promises made by God to the Synagogue and to its head were merely conditional, and were destined to have an end upon the final rejection of the unfaithful people, and the dissolution of the compact made with them. But these same promises may be considered to have been perpetual, in so much as they have a fulfilment in the Christian Church, which was figured and typified by the Church of the Jews,[36] and in the Christian Church

[34] J. W. Etheridge, *The Targums*, pt. ii., Glossary, n. v., p. 45.

[35] S. Chrysost., l. c.

[36] S. Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei*, l. xvii., cap. vi., cap. i., seq. (Op., t. vii., p. 523, seq. Edit. Migne).

they were destined to last till the end of the world, and to be fulfilled in the most perfect manner. The Christian Church possesses many prerogatives peculiar to itself, of which no participation whatever is found in the Old Testament economy, for the earlier dispensation was but the shadow, and enjoyed only a faulty and transient covenant. The Church of the New Testament, on the other hand, is the heavenly Jerusalem itself, endowed with the substance of good things, its covenant being established upon better promises and productive of a higher perfection. Such is the teaching of Scripture. But there are certain prerogatives which are necessarily found in every Church established by God for a supernatural end—in every Church the existence of which depends upon its safe preservation of a body of revealed doctrine, which it is bound to transmit to future time in its integrity. One of these essential prerogatives is the infallibility of the supreme ruler who is the centre of the Church, for without this infallibility there can be no guarantee that the deposit of doctrine will be preserved unchanged.

But the infallibility granted to the High Priest was limited; it extended no further than was necessary to secure the permanent existence of the Jewish Church, with unchanged symbol and exterior profession of faith. The peculiar Law and the peculiar doctrinal teaching of the Old Covenant all pointed towards the one central idea of the Messias, Whose coming to save mankind had been long ago promised by God, and for Whom all believers were waiting in constant expectation. This idea was to the Jewish Church a principle of life, maintaining it in vigour, and securing it against the natural tendency to decay. The preservation of this idea in its uncorrupted purity was then a matter of vital importance, and to secure this end was the object of the gift of infallibility conferred upon the Jewish

Church; and the same guarantee extended likewise to all revealed doctrines and divine institutions which were in any way connected with the central article of the Jewish faith. And thus we are brought to see in what sense it can be truly said that the infallibility granted to the High Priest was confined within certain limits. The meaning is not that though infallible while he remained within those limits he was nevertheless liable to transgress them, and by so doing sink to the ordinary level of fallible men; such a limitation is entirely destructive of the character of infallibility. The real limitation of the infallibility of the Pontiff was two-fold; those truths only were brought to his mind which the divine wisdom had judged suitable to be imparted to the Jewish Church, and at the same time he was hindered from going further, and promulgating as revealed any doctrine which did not truly form part of the revealed deposit. In the actual circumstances of the Jewish Church these limitations necessarily found place. Infallibility is a result of special divine assistance; it is no new revelation, hence it can extend only to such doctrines as have been already revealed. It excludes the idea of successive revelations.[37] God had made known to His chosen people a large body of truth, and the preservation of the knowledge of this truth in its purity was one object of the existence of the Jewish Church. No fuller revelation was needed, nor was any granted until the day when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles of Christ, and taught them all truth. The possession of the whole body of doctrine which God designed to impart to the race of man was the destined patrimony

[37] This principle belongs to the general theory of development of revealed doctrine, of which we shall speak in the third part of this work. For the present it will be enough to refer to St. Thomas, in iii. Dist., xxv., q. 11, a. 2, sol. 1, ad 5.

of the new Church founded on the day of Pentecost. The Church of the Old Covenant, we repeat, had no mission to preserve any portion of Revelation beyond the one central truth of the future coming of the Messiah, and such subordinate truths as bore upon this, and therefore the divine assistance given to the Pontiff was circumscribed within the same limits. While he kept within these bounds he was infallible, and he was hindered from attempting to teach as revealed anything which was not included within these same limits. But in the case of the infallibility promised to the Christian Church and enjoyed by it, there is no such limitation. The Apostles of Christ were instructed in "all truth," so that no future public revelation has ever been made since the times of the Apostles, nor will be to the end of time; and therefore the infallible authority of the divinely appointed Head of the Christian Church is equally unconfined by bounds and limits —it embraces all revealed truth. The Church of God in all ages has been under the unceasing guidance of the Holy Spirit, but His office in each age did not go beyond what was required by that age for the fulfilment of the work assigned it in the divine economy of redemption. The Jewish High Priest was the infallible guardian of an imperfect revelation; the Christian Pontiff, with the same infallibility, preserves the perfect body of truth delivered to the Apostles of Christ.

SECTION II.

INFALLIBILITY AND SUPREMACY. THE SAME PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE PROVE THE ONE AND THE OTHER.

THE business of the present section will be to establish that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility flows from every one of the passages of the Gospels in which mention is made of the Papal Supremacy. It has been usual with theologians who have treated this subject to confine themselves to the text in the twenty-second chapter of St. Luke, where Peter is commissioned to confirm his brethren; but it is difficult to conceive supremacy as existing in its fulness according to the idea held in the Catholic Church unless it includes infallibility as one of its essential prerogatives; and we cannot believe that the words by which the Divine Founder of the Church first promised to St. Peter and his Successors the supremacy of jurisdiction, and afterwards conferred it upon him and them, should not contain at least some reference to the kindred gift of infallibility in teaching. We are therefore encouraged to look into the well-known passages in the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew and the twenty-first of St. John; and doing so we find as full a demonstration that unity in the profession of the true faith, no less than the corporate unity of subjection to one head, was to be secured by the unshaken firmness of the rock of Peter. Nor must the proof we offer be deemed inadmissable as being new, and not founded on the teaching of the Fathers. Even if the fact were so, no valid objection could be based upon it; a constant progress and

development in the interpretation of Scripture is perfectly legitimate. But in truth, our interpretation is founded on the commentaries left us by the Fathers of the Church upon the passages in question. The teaching of antiquity has been handed down to us through successive ages, and has been a principal cause of the explicitness which the doctrine of Papal Infallibility has now attained.

Even those writers who deny Papal Infallibility admit that this prerogative was enjoyed by St. Peter, the divinely appointed Head of the Church. But the peculiar ministry of St. Peter did not terminate with the lifetime of the great Apostle. "Qu'on ne dise point," says Bossuet, in his magnificent sermon on the unity of the Church, "qu'on ne pense point que ce ministère de Saint Pierre finisse avec lui; ce qui doit servir de soutien à une Eglise éternelle ne peut jamais avoir de fin. Pierre vivra dans ses successeurs; Pierre parlera toujours dans sa chaire."[38] What is here said is true. The ministry of St. Peter shall continue for ever in the Church; the Chief of the Apostles shall live for ever in his Successors. The doctrine of Bossuet is that of the Fathers and Councils, inculcated by them so frequently that it seems superfluous to quote passages in illustration of so common a doctrine. Since then the ministry intrusted to St. Peter was the ministry of infallible teaching, this identical ministry will last for ever in the Church, and be exercised by the Successors of St. Peter. This follows clearly from the passages in which the divine establishment of this ministry in the person of St. Peter is recorded. By the words found in St. Matt. xvi. 18, as we proved in the first part of this work, Christ granted the supreme authority in the Church to St. Peter and his Successors. He constituted

[38] Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Unité de l'Eglise*, pt. i. (Ouvrages, t. i., p. 715. Paris, 1863).

St. Peter the foundation on which the Church was to be built;[39] and it follows that the ministry conferred upon St. Peter was such as to fulfil a function in the Church identical with that of the foundation of a building. But the whole building depends upon the foundation in such sense that the stability of the one is directly dependent upon the solidity of the other. We see therefore that the character of an authoritative teacher was an essential part of the ministry of St. Peter, by whom the Church was to be maintained in the true profession of the faith, and preserved from all inroads of error and heresy. Peter was to be the rock of the faith; wherefore the stability of the faith itself would be in direct proportion to the stability of Peter in his work of teaching the faith. That Christ promised to His Church stability in the faith needs no long proof; we need not go beyond the very verse on which we are commenting. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church;" nor is the meaning altered if we prefer the view of some expositors who believe that "hell" is here put for "death"—"The gates of death shall not prevail against the Church." The force of the expression is the same whichever interpretation is adopted.[40] What Christ intended to convey clearly

[39] *Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. ii., p. 29, seq.

[40] It is not necessary to our purpose to inquire whether the word πύλας ᾅδου should be rendered by "gates of death," or by "gates of hell." The word ᾅδης can well mean the one and the other. And, moreover, even if it should be translated by "death," that meaning would not be inappropriate; for the gates of death, or the power of the kingdom of death, would mean what St. Paul called the powers of darkness. Nevertheless, since Christ mentions immediately the Kingdom of Heaven, it seems more proper to adopt the other meaning, of "hell" for the word ᾅδης. The question will be found discussed by most modern commentators on the Gospels. See also Schleusner in *Lexico N. T. ad v.* ᾅδης; Passaglia, *De Prærogativis B. Petri*, l. ii., cap. vii., p. 465, seq. Ratisbonæ.

was this: the Church should withstand the attacks of all enemies who should at any time make assaults upon her; she should repulse the enemy, and herself remain unshaken; no hostile effort should have power to disturb the solidity of the faith of the Church: much more then must the faith of Peter and his Successors be firm, for they are the divinely appointed foundation on which the faith of the Church is rested. If the foundation were shaken, the edifice could not stand firm. This solidity of Peter in the faith, the necessary prerogative of the foundation-stone of the unshaken Church, was indicated by the new name which Christ promised and conferred on Simon, the son of John. It was not without design that the promise of indefectibility and infallibility is immediately subjoined to the words by which the office of Headship in the Church is conferred upon the chosen Disciple, whose solemn confession of faith in his Master's divinity had merited this sublime function; the second clause throws light on the meaning of the first. The circumstances under which the words were spoken must be borne in mind. Our Lord wished to bestow upon the Apostle some token of His own divine power, and therefore He raised the Disciple to a participation in the divine work and office of the Master, and applied to him a name which in its most perfect sense belongs only to Himself. The Divine Word made Man was alone primarily and by His own power the foundation-rock of the Church; but in a secondary sense Peter, himself founded on Christ, was to give support to the same Church.[41] But at the same time such firmness was necessarily granted to Peter as was necessary to secure to the Church the stability by which it should remain unshaken amid all the assaults of the powers of hell. A logical link of connection exists between

[41] See *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. ii.

the two members of the verse before us. The Church is to be built upon a rock, and *therefore* the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. The Church is founded on Peter, and *therefore* it shall always be triumphant over its enemies, and shall always preserve without blemish the purity of the deposit of faith intrusted to its keeping. This form of expression clearly implies that Peter is the immediate immoveable rock of the Church, in whom resides that strength and power which shall resist successfully the gates of hell. Bossuet, before his genius broke away from the guidance of the Catholic instinct, put exactly this meaning upon the passage: "Tu es Pierre," he says, "je t'ai changé ton nom de Simon en celui de Pierre, en signe de la fermeté que je te veux communiquer, non-seulment pour toi, mais encore pour toute mon Eglise; car je la veux bâtir sur cette pierre. Je veux mettre en toi, d'une manière éminente et particulière, la prédication de la foi, qui en sera le fondement, et les postes d'enfer ne prévandront point contre elle."[42] Had not Gallican prejudices interfered with his convictions, he would not have swerved from this view in his *Gallia Orthodoxa.*[43]

But our interpretation does not rest on the authority of Bossuet, nor of any modern writer; it is in accordance with the views of many among the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. St. Peter is called the most firm, the most solid, the unshaken, immoveable, insuperable and unconquerable rock, and more firm than a rock. Such is the language of Origen,[44] of St. Hilary,[45]

[42] *Méditations sur les Evangiles*, lxx. jour (Ouvrages, t. ix., p. 371. Edit. cit.).

[43] See pt. iii., ch. xxxiv., p. 471. seq. (Ouvrages, t. vii. Edit. cit.).

[44] Origenes, *Homil.* v., *in Exodum*, n. 4 (Op., t. ii., p. 145. Edit. Delarue). "Ecclesiæ fundamento et petræ solidissimæ, super quam Christus fundavit Ecclesiam."

[45] S. Hilarius, *De Trinitate*, l. vi., n. 37, seq., p. 160, seq. Edit. Maur. (Op., t. ii.).

of St. Ambrose,[46] of St. Cyril of Alexandria,[47] of St. Chrysostom,[48] of St. Augustine,[49] or the author of the *Vocatio Gentium*,[50] and of several writers of a later date.[51] Similar language is found also in many liturgical books which attest the universal tradition of the Church.[52] In speaking of St. Peter, the Fathers had two things in view: that he personally received the gift that his own faith should be firm and immoveable; and that the Church was to derive from him the support which would avail to resist all the attacks of the powers of hell, and to overcome all heresies throughout the world. "The faith of Peter," says St. Hilary, "is the foundation of the Church, through it the gates of hell shall be weak against her."[53] "This faith," says St. Ambrose, "is the groundwork of the Church, for not of Peter's flesh, but of his faith it was said that the gates of death should not prevail against it. His confession defeated hell. And this confession itself overturned more than one heresy. The Church, like a stout vessel, is beaten by many stormy waves;

[46] S. Ambrosius, *De Incarnatione Dominici Sacrament.*, cap. v., n. 34, seq. (Op., t. ii., p. 711. Edit. Maur.).

[47] S. Cyrillus Alex., *De Sanct. Trinitate*, dial. iv. (Op., t. viii., p. 865. Edit. Migne).

[48] S. Chrysostomus, *Hom.* liv. al. lv., *in Matt.*, n. 2 (Op., t. vii., p. 548. Edit. Maur.).

[49] S. Augustinus, *Psalmus contra partem Donati* (Op., t. ix., p. 30. Edit. Migne).

[50] *De Vocatione Gentium*, l. ii., cap. xxviii., p. 714 (Edit. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. li.).

[51] The discussion of these passages will occupy us in a later section.

[52] S. Leonis Magni, *Sacramentarium*, vi. (Op., t. ii., p. 38. Edit. Ballerini); xvii. (l. c., p. 42); xxv. (l. c., p. 46); *Liturgia Mozarabica*, t. i.; *Missale Mixtum*, in Festo Apost. Petri et Pauli, p. 766 (Edit. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxxxv.).

[53] S. Hilarius, l. c. "Hæc fides (Petri) Ecclesiæ fundamentum erit: per hanc fidem infirmæ adversus eam sunt portæ infernorum."

and therefore the foundation of the Church must be sufficient against all heresies."[54] St. Cyril of Alexandria takes the same view. Having quoted the foregoing passage of St. Matthew, he continues: "The name of 'Rock' is, it would seem, given denominatively to the unshaken, firmly founded faith of the Disciple, whereon the Church of Christ is established and based, so that it cannot fall, but shall abide for ever, withstanding the assaults even of the very gates of hell."[55] St. Chrysostom plainly confesses that it belongs to God alone to make the Church strong to hold up against such an irruption of waves, and to render a fisherman more firm than any rock, whilst the whole world is waging war against him; but at the same time he asserts that Christ promised these things to Peter. "God the Father," he goes on, "speaking to Jeremias, promised to set him as a pillar of brass, and as a wall, but the Prophet indeed to one nation only; this man to all the world."[56] St. Asterius too remarks that Peter was denominated by

[54] S. Ambrosius, l. c., cap. v., n. 34, seq. "Fides (Petri) est Ecclesiæ fundamentum: non enim de carne Petri, sed de fide dictum est, quia portæ mortis ei (fidei Petri) non prævalebunt, sed confessio vicit infernum. Et hæc confessio non unam hæresim exclusit; nam cum Ecclesia multis tanquam bona navis fluctibus sæpe tundatur, adversus omnes hæreses debet valere Ecclesiæ fundamentum."

[55] S. Cyrillus, l. c. Πέτραν, οἶμαι, παρωνύμως, ἕτερον οὐδὲν ἢ τὴν ἀκατάσειστον καὶ ἑδραιοτάτην τοῦ μαθητοῦ πίστιν ἀποκαλῶν, ἐφ' ᾗ καὶ ἀδιαπτώτως ἐρήρεισταί τε καὶ διαπέπηγεν ἡ ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ αὐταῖς ἀνάλωτος ταῖς ᾅδου πύλαις εἰσαεὶ διαμένουσα.

[56] S. Chrysostomus, l. c. Ἃ γὰρ Θεοῦ μόνου ἐστὶν ἴδια . . . τὸ ἀπερίτρεπτον τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ποιῆσαι ἐν τοσαύτῃ κυμάτων ἐμβολῇ καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἁλιέα πέτρας πάσης ἀποφῆναι στερεότερον τῆς, οἰκουμένης πολεμούσης ἁπάσης, ταῦτα αὐτὸς ἐπαγγέλλεται δώσειν· καθάπερ ὁ Πατὴρ πρὸς τὸν Ἱερεμίαν διαλεγόμενος ἔλεγεν· Ὡς στῦλον χαλκοῦν καὶ ὡσεὶ τεῖχος θήσειν αὐτόν· αλλ' ἐκεῖνον μὲν ἑνὶ ἔθνει, τοῦτον δὲ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης.

Christ "rock of faith." "Through him therefore," the Saint continues, "the stability of the Church is preserved unswerving and incapable of fall."[57]

Not to multiply quotations, we will add only one passage of Origen, which furnishes a clear proof of the doctrine which we are maintaining. This ancient writer quotes from St. Matthew the words, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and continues: "To what does *it* refer?—to the rock on which Christ is to build the Church, or to the Church itself?—for the phrase is ambiguous. Or is the reference to the rock and the Church as to one and the same thing? This seems to be the true meaning, for the gates of hell shall prevail neither against the rock on which Christ is to build His Church, nor against the Church itself."[58] We need go no farther; if all the commentaries left to us by antiquity upon the passage of St. Matthew be collected and compared, it will be seen that they are all in accord with those which we have cited; they teach that by virtue of Christ's promise, and as the divinely appointed means to save the Church from falling under the attacks of the gates of hell, Peter became the immoveable Rock of the Faith.

Satan uses various means in his attempt to overthrow the Church of God; persecutions raised by the powerful Princes of this world are a familiar weapon

[57] S. Asterius, *Homilia in Apost. Petrum et Paulum* (Edit. Migne, *PP. GG.*, t. xl., p. 268). *Τῇ ὁμοίᾳ δε κλήσει ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν πρῶτον αὐτοῦ μαθητὴν κατεκόσμησε, πέτραν ὀνομάσας τῆς πίστεως· διὰ Πέτρον τοίνυν ἄπτωτον καὶ ἀκλινὲς τὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἔδρασμα σώζεται.*

[58] Origenes, *In Matt.*, t. xii., n. ii. (Op., t. iii.; p. 526. Edit. Delarue). *Τίνος δὲ, αὐτῆς; ἆρα γὰρ τῆς πέτρας, ἐφ' ἣν Χριστὸς οἰκοδομεῖ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν; ἢ τῆς ἐκκλησίας; ἀμφίβολος γὰρ ἡ φράσις. ἢ ὡς ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς πέτρας, καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας; τοῦτο δὲ οἶμαι ἀληθὲς τυγχάνειν, οὔτε γὰρ τῆς πέτρας, ἐφ' ἧς ὁ Χριστὸς οἰκοδομεῖ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οὔτε τῆς ἐκκλησίας πύλαι ᾅδου κατισχύσουσιν.*

in his hands, but his chief hope lies in the endeavour to corrupt the purity of the faith by instilling the poison of false doctrine; and this consideration led St. Epiphanius and St. Jerome to suppose that by the "gates of hell" was meant the doctrine of heretics, and the heretics themselves.[59] But according to the divine promise, the Church will never succumb to the effects of persecution or of heresy; it will stand ever firm, and its divine indefectibility will be ever manifested by its uninterrupted existence and the untainted purity of its doctrine. Peter then being the rock of the Church and of the faith, must never fail to support the superstructure, the Church and the faith, against persecution and error; the corner-stone of the whole building must be itself immoveable, and Peter must be infallible in his teaching. This is the spirit of the prayer which is appropriated to the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul in the Sacramentary of St. Leo the Great.[60]

After what we have said, we shall have no need to dwell long on the nineteenth verse of this same sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew, but we cannot pass it over in silence, as is commonly done by theologians who have treated of Papal Infallibility; it furnishes a clear proof of our doctrine. The verse runs as follows: "I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven." We remarked on a former occasion, that Christ in these words

[59] S. Epiphanius, *Ancorat.*, n. ix. (Op., t. ii., p. 14). πύλαι δὲ ᾅδου αἱ αἱρέσεις, καὶ οἱ αἱρεσιάρχαι. S. Hieronymus, l. iii., *In Matt.* xvi. 18 (Op., t. vii., p. 124. Edit. Vallarsi). "Portæ inferi . . . certe hæreticorum doctrinas, per quæ illecti homines ducuntur ad tartarum."

[60] *Sacramentarium Leonis*, in Missa ix. Nat. Apost. Petri et Pauli (In Op. S. Leonis, t. ii., p. 38. Edit. Ballerini).

promised to St. Peter a kingly dignity in the Church. We may now add that the clause which speaks of "binding and loosing" confers upon the same Apostle a legislative and judicial power of absolutely indefinite extension, so that authority was given to him to judge all causes, and to enact laws on every subject in the Church. It is acknowledged by Protestant commentators that to bind and to loose signifies to legislate; the Church, they say, has the power to make laws obligatory in conscience; but many among them go on to limit this right, as though the legislative authority of the Church could go no further than to permit what was already lawful, and to forbid what was unlawful, even before the prohibition.[61] But they have no solid ground to allege in favour of this restriction and limitation. They say that the words translated "bind" and "loose" corresponded to certain Hebrew words which were used in the above restricted sense. But this argument is fallacious, for the restricted use in question was not common to the Jewish people, but belonged exclusively to the two schools of Shammeas and Hillel; for instance, Josephus neglects the restriction, so that no basis is laid for applying it to the interpretation of the words in St. Matthew. Moreover, the second part of the verse before us is so closely united to the first clause, that the second part must receive an interpretation not less extensive than that given to the words "Kingdom of Heaven," the keys of which were given by Christ to Peter. The symbol of the keys show that the supreme, royal authority in the Kingdom of Heaven was intrusted to the chosen Apostle, and therefore the unrestricted right of legis-

[61] This interpretation is that of Seldon, Lightfoot, Whitty, Hoadley, Daillé, and of many among the recent rationalists. It is examined at length by Father Passaglia in his work, *De Prærogativis B. Petri.* See l. ii., cap. ix., n. 118, seq., p. 493, seq.

lation must have belonged to him, as Prince, and to him also in the same character belonged the right of judging without appeal all causes arising in the Church. The context therefore clearly shows that no limitations can be admitted to the power of "binding and loosing," and the research of modern students of rabbinical literature furnishes no sufficient ground for departing from the meaning which Christian tradition has always affixed to the power of "binding and loosing."[62] Before pointing out the argument in favour of the Infallibility of the Pope which we draw from this verse of the Gospel, we have thought it right to show what is the full unrestricted meaning of the words employed by the Evangelist; but our argument does not absolutely require us to do so, but retains its force even if the restricted interpretation be adopted. This will be seen presently.

According, then, to the ancient Catholic interpretation of this nineteenth verse, Christ conferred upon Peter the prerogative of being the supreme legislator and judge in the Church, to decide with independent authority all questions of faith, morals, or discipline. St. Peter's ministry comprehended each of these subjects. And a guarantee that Peter shall exercise this office with effect is given by the divine promise. The extension of this promise is the same as that of the prerogative granted to Peter—it has no limits; the relative "whatsoever" embraces all that is comprehended in the prerogative. In other words, Christ gives the assurance that He from Heaven would give His sanction to every law that Peter should enact on earth for the government of the Church, to every declaration

[62] Morinus (*De Sacr. Pœnit.*, l. i., cap. viii., l. iv., cap. xxiii., p. 17, seq., p. 225, seq. Antuerpiæ), and Rich. Simon (*In Notis ad Versionem Gall.*, l. c.), adopt the restricted view which is common among the Protestant commentators.

of faith which he should put forth. Either, then, this promise is a promise of infallibility to Peter, or God by it engages Himself to sanction and give divine authority to laws and declarations which may by possibility be in opposition to the principles of faith and morals. The force of this argument could be evaded only by proving that the promise of Christ was subject to some limitation; that Christ really declared only that He would adopt merely such of Peter's laws and declarations as were found to be free from doctrinal error. But there is no shadow of a ground for alleging that any such limitation is expressed or implied, and, in fact, it is opposed to the whole tenour of the passage. It remains, therefore, that the Infallibility of Peter and his Successors must be admitted to be deduced from the words which we are considering. It is strange that this simple argument seems to have escaped the notice of previous writers upon the question. It will be seen that its force is not weakened even if the narrower meaning be given to the words "bind and loose."

When the Fathers, following the language of our text, speak of St. Peter's judgments as heavenly;[63] when they say that in his judgments on earth he is a judge of Heaven;[64] that to him was imparted the power of binding and loosing in Heaven as well as on earth;[65] by these and similar expressions they imply their belief in the traditional doctrine of the Infallibility of St. Peter in all questions of faith and morals. The expressions used would be inapplicable unless St. Peter's declarations and judgments were founded in truth and justice, nor

[63] S. Hilarius, *De Trinitate*, l. vi., n. 37, seq., p. 187 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Migne).

[64] S. Hilarius, *Tract. in Ps.* cxxxi., n. 4, p. 730 (Op., t. i. Edit. Migne).

[65] Tertullianus, *De Præscriptionibus*, cap. xxii., p. 405 (Op., t. i. Edit. Moreau).

would the Fathers have assumed *à priori* that truth and justice characterised the acts of St. Peter and his Successors unless they were practically convinced that the gift of infallibility had been conferred upon the Apostle. In the two verses of St. Matthew which we have been examining, one prerogative is actually conferred upon St. Peter and a second is promised to him; he is made Head and corner-stone of the Church, the power of the keys is promised, and we have seen that the Infallibility of Peter is involved in the Idea of these prerogatives, so that it can be distinguished from them only by a process of abstraction in our minds.

There are two other passages which point more directly at the prerogative of infallibility granted to St. Peter; these are St. Luke xxii. 31, and John xxi. 15—17. We must discuss these passages separately. The passage of St. Luke is as follows:—"And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou once converted (ἐπιστρέψας), confirm thy brethren."[66] At the Last Supper, the Apostles, who had not yet received the virtue from on high, strove amongst them which should be accounted greatest. The Lord rebuked them, and took the occasion to give them lessons of lowliness and humility. He warns them that the greatest among them should behave as the younger, and he that is chief as he that serves. He calls to their mind His own example, that He had humbled Himself and been among them as one that serves. He reminds them of the persecutions and trials which, in company with Him,

[66] Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Σίμων, Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς, τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπῃ ἡ πίστις σοῦ, καὶ σὺ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέψας στήριζον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου (Lucæ xxii. 31, 32).

they had undergone, but at the same time He bids them look forward to the Kingdom, great and glorious, which He appointed unto them, as His Father had appointed unto Him. Then He abruptly turns the discourse to Simon Peter, as if the idea of trials and temptations had brought to His mind the future persecutions of His Church, and had induced Him to reveal the plan on which the Church was to be built, and by which it should stand up against and resist assaults and troubles of every kind. He calls Peter by his name—"Simon, Simon;" He lays open to His Apostle the approaching dangers which would threaten them all, not omitting to mention the author of the evil—"Satan." Satan could not hide his evil designs from the knowledge of our Divine Lord, who here lets His creatures into the secret of the hidden designs of the Evil One, declaring at the same time that His own permission was necessary before these designs could be put in execution. This permission is not given to the full extent desired by Satan; the Apostles are not given up wholly to their enemy to be harassed and tempted, to the imperilling and overthrow of their fidelity and constancy. The word "desired to have you" (ἐξῃτήσατο) means that Satan asked that they should be delivered up to his own power, and we are reminded of the temptation of Job,[67] as is remarked by several commentators both Catholic and Protestant. The powers of darkness could not have ventured to attack the divine edifice of the Church had not God first said to them: "Behold, it is in your hand."[68] In accordance with the wise designs of God's providence, the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, was to be delivered up to the persecutions of Satan, that by its endurance of trials the divinity of its origin might be declared. All the efforts of Satan would then be

[67] Job i. 12, ii. 6. [68] *Ibid.*

directed to the overthrow of the Church; he would use every endeavour to sift or scatter its leaders, supporters, and pillars, that these being removed, the whole building might crumble to pieces. It is clear that the temptation to which Christ alludes was a temptation against faith, for its remedy is found in our Saviour's prayer that the faith of Peter might not fail. But as all the Apostles were alike exposed to the persecution of Satan, we might have expected that the prayer would have embraced them all, and yet in fact stability in the faith is asked on behalf of Peter alone. The reason of this can be no other than that Peter being the foundation and rock of the Church, the whole building was to derive from him the strength and firmness which should resist the assaults and wiles of Satan. Accordingly, in the second member of the verse we find a direct allusion to this peculiar office and function of St. Peter: "And thou, once converted, confirm thy brethren."

The brethren of whom Christ speaks in this place are evidently the Apostles, of whom He had spoken in the preceding verse; they represent the whole Church of Christ, pastors and sheep alike. Peter is appointed to strengthen them all, and to keep them steady in the profession of that faith against which the efforts of Satan would be directed. On this account Christ prayed that the faith of Peter should not fail. It follows that the gift of indefectibility in the faith which the prayer of Christ gained for Peter is closely connected with the effect which this indefectibility was destined to cause—the successful resistance of the Church to all the efforts of the powers of hell. From this view of the nature of the means by which the Church was to be eternally secured from error, there at once follows the personal infallibility of the Head and Ruler of the Church. The duty belonging to the office

of Head of the Church was that of strengthening the brethren in the faith, so as to secure the Church from error, and in no other way could this be done than by putting forth a symbol of faith, and imposing upon all the obligation of accepting this symbol, giving it interior and exterior assent, and condemning every doctrine to which it was opposed. But it would be impossible for the Supreme Pastor of Christ's sheep thus to bring every understanding into captivity, unless his word had the character of a divine utterance, and a divine utterance is infallibly true. Peter and his Successors were to offer triumphant resistance to the efforts of Satan; where the enemy caused darkness they were to give light; where the enemy raised doubts and agitation, conviction and calm were to flow from the Chair of St. Peter: but this divine economy could not possibly be carried out if the least room for misgiving could remain after Peter had spoken — if by any possibility Peter could himself be changed into an ally and instrument of Satan. The power and obligation of confirming the brethren necessarily implies the singular gift of infallibility. The prayer of Christ was effectual; the Church is secure against all the efforts of Satan, and this security is gained by the perpetual prerogative of Peter and his Successors.

We may fittingly close this Scriptural argument by quoting a passage from Bossuet:—"Cette parole," he says, alluding to the words of St. Luke, "n'est pas un commandement qu'il fasse en particulier à Saint Pierre; c'est un office qu'il exige et qu'il institue dans son Eglise à perpétuité." And he assigns the reason in the following terms:—"Il y devait toujours avoir un Pierre dans l'Eglise pour confirmer ses frères dans la foi; c'était le moyen le plus propre pour établir l'unité des sentiments que le Sauveur désirait plus que toutes choses: et cette autorité était d'autant plus nécessaire aux successeurs

des Apôtres que leur foi était moins affermie que celle de leurs Auteurs."[69]

If we turn now to the patristic comments upon this passage of St. Luke, we find that the Fathers are unanimously of opinion that the words of Christ were addressed to St. Peter alone among the Apostles, and that they contain the promise of infallibility to him. They remark that Christ prayed especially for St. Peter that his faith might not fail, and this prayer was sure to obtain all that was asked. This is said expressly by St. Augustine,[70] St. Chrysostom,[71] and others.[72] They point

[69] Bossuet, *Med.*, lxxii., pt. i. (Op., t. ix, p. 374. Paris, 1863). The argument, which we draw from St. Luke's words in favour of Papal Infallibility, does not depend upon the interpretation of the participle ἐπιστρέψας. However, a short discussion of this word may contribute to render the passage somewhat clearer. Although some of the Fathers understood the word in the sense of *resipiscere* ("repent"), others already took it to denote *vicissim* ("in turn"); among these latter was St. Augustine (*Serm.* ccx., n. 6. Op., t. v., p. 1050. Edit. Migne). This interpretation, which has been recently promoted by some German Protestants, as Kuinœl, Bengel, Rosenmüller, and others, and opposed by several Anglicans, as Bloomfield and Alford, is then not new in the Church; and it certainly agrees well with the context of the passage. Moreover, St. Luke never uses the verb ἐπιστρέφειν for "to convert himself," without the addition of "to the Lord," except in two cases in which the context forces the word to yield this sense. Whenever it is used by the Evangelist absolutely, it means "to turn himself." The phrase may be taken for an Hebraism, being as frequently used by the Seventy when rendering the verb *sob*, which bears the sense of *vicissim* as often as it affects another verb, standing in place of the adverb which modern languages would employ in like cases. St. Luke in the passage in question may have followed this Hebrew usage.

[70] S. Augustinus, *De Correptione et Gratia*, cap. viii., n. 17 (Op., t. x., p. 926. Edit. Migne).

[71] S. Chrysostomus, *Hom.* lxxxii. al. lxxxiii., *in Matt.*, n. 3 (Op., t. vii., p. 785, seq. Edit. Maur.).

[72] In the following sections we will show at greater length how Catholic tradition has always been unanimous in the interpretation of this passage of the Gospel.

out the perfect agreement which exists between this passage of St. Luke and the establishment of St. Peter as the Rock of the Church, as related by St. Matthew. They say that the prayer of Christ mentioned in St. Luke impetrated for St. Peter the grace of being the "firm support" (στήριγμα) of the Church;[73] whilst in St. Matthew, the Son of God, in virtue of His own divine power, constitutes His Disciple the Foundation and Rock of the same Church.[74] They observe, further, that infallibility was not granted to St. Peter for the sake of himself alone, but with a view to the duty imposed upon him of confirming his brethren, for whose benefit he was to use the gift he had received.[75] The Fathers also explain the commission to confirm the brethren of St. Peter's supreme *magisterium*, by virtue of which he was the appointed teacher of all who should receive the faith. Thus we read of St. Cyril of Alexandria: "The Lord said to Peter—'And thou when converted strengthen thy brethren,' that is to say, be the support and teacher (διδάσκαλος) of all those who come to Me by faith."[76] According, then, to St.

[73] In the passage of St. Luke, στηρίζω is an architectonic word. Hence St. Peter, to whom Christ said στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου, is called by the Fathers στήριγμα, the prop and sustainer of the Church.

[74] S. Chrysostomus, l. c.; S. Ambrosius, *De Fide*, l. iv., cap. v., n. 56 (Op., t. ii., p. 531. Edit. Maur.). In the next section we shall see that the Roman Pontiffs often brought the two passages together when asserting their divine prerogatives.

[75] S. Chrysost., *De B. Philogono, Hom.* vi., n. 2 (Op., t. i., p. 496. Edit. Maur.). κἀγὼ ἐδεήθην περί σου, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ πίστις σου· τίνα οὖν ταύτης κηδεμονίας καὶ τῆς προνοίας ἀποδίδως μοι τὴν ἀμοιβήν; ἄρα ποίαν ἀμοιβὴν ζητεῖ; τὴν αὐτὴν ταύτην πάλιν· καὶ σὺ γάρ, φησὶ, ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου. Beda, *Exp. Evangelii St. Lucæ*, l. vi. (Op. t. iii. Edit Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. 92, p. 600). Other passages will be found in the next section.

[76] S. Cyrillus Alex., *In Lucam* xxii. 32 (*In Bibl. PP. Mai*, t. ii., p. 420). καὶ φησί, καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου· -ουτέστι,γενοῦ στήριγμα καὶ διδάσκαλος τῶν διὰ πίστεως προσιόντων ἐμοί-

Cyril, to confirm the brethren is to exercise the supreme ministry of teaching all the Faithful, in such a manner as to fortify them and render them proof against the temptations of Satan and his ministers, no otherwise could all the Faithful be sustained and supported. And without the divine gift of infallibility this office could not be performed. Theophylact also, who derived his doctrine from the ancient Greek Fathers, makes the same comment on the words of our Lord to Peter. "Since I appointed thee Prince of all the Apostles," says he, speaking in Christ's person, "confirm the others, for this becomes thee . . . who art, after Me, the rock and the foundation of the Church."[77] According to this, St. Peter received the office of confirming the brethren because he was appointed the solid rock on which the Church should be built, and as such he was to support the whole fabric by the massive and immoveable strength of its foundation. With the same view the Fathers called him the tongue of the Disciples, and of the body of the brethren, the voice of the heralds, the eye of the Apostles,[78] the leader and doctor of all the habitable world.[79] The phrases thus applied to St. Peter would be meaningless did they not import the idea of his infallibility in teaching. Otherwise he would be the official tongue, the voice, the leader of all the Church, but it would be possible that he should lead it to error and destruction. He would be the eye of the Apostles, but being liable to become blind, he might verify that saying of our Lord—"If the blind lead the blind both shall fall into

[77] Theophylactus, *Comm. in Lucam* xxii. 31 (Op., t. i., p. 471. Edit. Venetiis).

[78] S. Ephrem, *Sermo in SS. Apostolos* (Op., Græca, t. iii., p. 464. Edit. Assemanni); *In Bibl. Orient.*, Assemanni, t. i., p. 95.

[79] S. Chrysostomus, *Hom.* lxxxviii., *in Joan.*, n. 1 (Op., t. viii., p. 527).

the ditch." It is inconceivable that Christ should have planned an organisation for His Church, such as might itself become the source of its ruin. Nor did the Fathers limit their interpretation to St. Peter only, but they were clearly persuaded that Christ's words recorded by St. Luke regarded all St. Peter's Successors to the end of the world. We will say nothing here of the Roman Pontiffs, who, as will be seen in another section, from the earliest ages of Christianity solemnly proclaimed this doctrine. We are in no want of other witnesses on the subject. Among the Greeks, Stephen of Dora distinctly maintained our interpretation at the Lateran Council, under Pope Martin I.;[80] Theodorus Studita, writing to Pope Paschal, adverted to the words of Christ as addressed to him.[81] Theophylact himself, whose mind was nourished on the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, and especially of St. Chrysostom, noticed that the words in Luke xxii. regarded all the Faithful who should be confirmed by St. Peter till the consummation of the world.[82] But, above all, Gregory of Trebizond expressly asserts that the privilege meant by these words was not granted to Peter alone, but to the Roman Church; first, because, Christ prayed for Peter alone, while Satan was left at liberty to sift all the Apostles; and, moreover, because to St. Peter the office is intrusted of confirming his brethren, which office, as we learn from history, was performed not by Peter alone but by his Successors.[83] As to the Latins, it would be idle to produce witnesses in the matter, since the persuasion

[80] In Conc. Lat. sub Martino I., secr. ii. (Labbe, *Conc.*, t. vii., p. 108).

[81] Theodorus Studita, *Epist. ad Paschalem Papam* (Migne, *Bibl. PP. Græc.*, t. xcix., p. 1152, seq.).

[82] Theophylactus, l. c.

[83] Gregorius Trapezuntius, *De Una, Sancta, Catholica Ecclesia*, n. 7 (Leo Allatius, *Græciæ Orthodoxiæ*, t. i., p. 550, seq.).

has ever been deeply rooted in the Western Church, which was always under the immediate government of the Roman Pontiff. It is enough to mention the names of St. Bernard,[84] of St. Peter Damian,[85] and of St. Anselm,[86] who distinctly acknowledge that the passage in question refers to the Roman Pontiffs.

To complete our Scriptural demonstration of Papal Infallibility nothing remains but to examine the last testimony from St. John xxi. 15, seq. It is not easy to understand why many among the supporters of Papal Infallibility do not believe the passage capable of yielding any effective proof in favour of that doctrine, although they cannot help admitting that it refers to the appointment of St. Peter to the office of supreme governor in the Church. But let us attentively consider its purport, before drawing from it an argument for Papal Infallibility.

The third time Christ showed Himself to His Disciples after His glorious resurrection, we read, "He said to Simon Peter: Son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He says unto him, Feed My lambs." And He addressed Peter in the same manner a second and a third time, each time giving the commission, "Feed My sheep." Now on this our first remark is, that Christ requires of Peter a love greater than that felt for their Master by the other Apostles; and the power to elicit the degree of love required must have been itself given by Christ. And since the high degree of love borne by St. Peter was

[84] S. Bernardus, *Epist.* cxc. *ad Innocentium II. Papam* (Op., t. ii., p. 221. Edit. Gillotii).

[85] S. Petrus Damianus, *Serm.* xxiii., *De Nativitate S. Joannis Baptistæ* (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. cxliv., p. 636).

[86] S. Anselmus Lucensis, *Contra Guibertum Antipapam*, l. ii. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. cxlix, p. 469).

the motive leading Christ to intrust him with a peculiar office, the extent of that office must be measured by, and correspond to, the degree of the love; that is, it must be an office excelling that of the other Apostles. Thus we understand why Christ intrusted to St. Peter the care of the sheep and of the lambs, constituting him Ecumenical Pastor over the whole flock in the Church. We need not insist further on this point, which was fully treated in the foregoing part of our work; but we must point out how the passage bears on that Papal Infallibility which we are now considering. We say then that according to the foregoing passage a broad line of demarcation is drawn between the ministry of the Bishops, successors of the Apostles, and of the Pope, the Successor of St. Peter. The Bishops indeed, as shepherds, are to feed and tend their own several flocks, the people committed to their care; but the Pope, being the Ecumenical Pastor, not only must feed and tend in a general way all the nations of the world in general, but he must in an especial manner feed and tend the Bishops themselves, who are Fathers and Shepherds in the Church: in other words, the Pope is the Father of the Fathers, the Pastor of the Pastors. The Church of Christ was to be one flock and one Pastor; but the organic principle of that unity was to be derived from the cleaving of all the Bishops to the Supreme Pastor, in all that concerns ecclesiastical government and faith. Peter, living in his Successors, was to feed with his divine doctrine his fellow Bishops, that they might each exercise the same ministry towards their own people; he was in his own diocese to tend them by the exercise of kingly and judicial authority, that the whole Church might have both internal and external unity. He ought to be the Supreme Master and Guardian of faith over the very Masters and Guardians of faith divinely appointed in the Church of

Christ. But without the gift of infallibility it would be impossible for him to exercise this supreme power. If the Supreme Pastor is liable to error and heresy, the constitution given by Christ to His Church would be imperfect, and might lead it to ruin. Peter is constituted by Christ the supreme earthly Pastor of the Church, destined to fill the place of the Divine Head Himself. The Bishops are, it is true, Shepherds, Fathers, and Teachers of the people whom they feed and guide; but at the same time they are themselves sheep of the flock of Peter, and rightly look to him for food and guidance. That Peter should be fed by the Bishops, the Shepherd by the sheep, would be an inversion of order. Our risen Lord gave to Peter the charge to feed the Apostles just as before His Passion He had given the commission, "Strengthen thy brethren;" but we nowhere read that any such function was conferred on any other Apostle, to feed or strengthen Peter, or the other members of the Apostolic college. Nor do the Fathers yield us any traces of tradition to supply the silence of Scripture. If then by possibility the Head Shepherd could offer to the sheep baneful food by propounding heretical doctrine and enforcing it with the weight of his authority, it follows that either the Bishops would receive the poison at his hands, and pass it on to their several flocks, to the infection of the whole Church with heresy and error; or that the Bishops, the sheep of Peter, would leave their position, and constitute themselves the Shepherds of the Head Shepherd, and force him to accept at their hands the food of the true doctrine. Whichever alternative is adopted, the divine organisation of the Church would be entirely destroyed. If Peter is appointed Pastor of all the Faithful, and commissioned to feed the Bishops as well as their flocks, he must necessarily be infallible.

The successive Popes, conscious whence they derive

their authority in the Church, have always made appeal to these passages of St. Luke and St. John, as often as they wished to set forth the grounds of their right to teach the people of Christ; they speak of the offices of feeding the sheep and confirming the brethren as identical, and as explanatory the one of the other. As Christ prayed for Peter that his faith might not fail, whilst he exercised the great ministry of confirming the brethren; so He obtained for him the same gift of infallibility that he might perfectly discharge the high office of feeding the sheep. And therefore Origen,[87] St. Cyprian,[88] and other Fathers,[89] when speaking of the commission of feeding the sheep intrusted to Peter, remark that on him, as on a solid and immoveable rock, the Church was founded; as if they would say, that the charge of feeding the sheep of the fold of Christ imparted an authority of the same character as the prerogative of being the unshaken and firm Rock of the Church; which would therefore imply infallibility in faith.

Thus by an examination of four independent passages of the Gospel we have found four distinct arguments for the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; while the four taken together afford the clearest proof of our point. We shall see in another section that this cumulative argument has often been used by the Popes themselves. It is most luminously put forward by Bossuet, although that great writer drew from it no conclusion beyond the infallibility of the Roman See, not seeing that the gift must extend to individual Popes. Our readers will be glad to read the following remarkable words, in which Bossuet is speaking of the verse of St. Luke on which we have commented: "Cette

[87] Origenes, *In Epist. ad Romanos*, l. v., n. 10 (Op., t. iv., p. 568. Edit. cit.).

[88] *De habitu Virginum*, p. 176. Edit. Baluzii.

[89] See the following section.

parole revient manifestement à celle où il avait dit: 'Tu es Pierre' je t'ai changé ton nom de Simon en celui de Pierre, en signe de la fermeté que je te veux communiquer, non-seulement pour toi, mais encore pour toute mon Eglise: car, 'Je te veux bâtir sur cette pierre,' je veux mettre en toi, d'une manière éminente et particulière, la prédication de la foi, qui en sera le fondement; 'et les portes d'enfer ne prévaudront point contre elle;' c'est à dire, qu'elle sera affermie contre tous les efforts de Satan, jusqu' à être inébranlable. Et cela, qu'est ce autre chose que ce que Jesus Christ répète ici: 'Satan a demandé de vous cribler; mais, Pierre, j'ai prié pour toi, ta foi ne défaudra pas; et toi, confirme tes frères?' . . . C'est pourquoi Jésus Christ lui dit encore, et non pas à Jean, ni aux autres, dans le temps de cette pêche: 'Pais mes brebis, pais mes agneaux:' pais les mères comme les petits; ce qui revient au commandement de les affermir dans la foi, puisque cela même, c'est gouverner le troupeau, c'est, dis-je, le gouverner que d'y affermir cet esprit de foi, et le paître par la parole."[90]

If Dr. Pusey and his friends had considered these words, they would not have been so easy in asserting that they would not object to the principles and terms of Bossuet. At all events they would have at least abstained from boldly venturing on the assertion that the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope is opposed to the original constitution of the Church.[91] The Church, according to the fancy of Dr. Pusey, is built up "like a number of colonies sent out from a mother country, altogether independent, except, indeed so far as the civil power unites any number of them together."[92]

[90] Bossuet, *Meditations sur les Evangiles*, partie i., med. lxx. (Op., l. c., p. 371).

[91] Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 124.

[92] *Tract* xc., sec. 12, p. 80. Edition of 1865.

Such a Church never existed, but certainly it would not need any Papal Infallibility. But a Church which was built on the rock of Peter, which was constituted under the kingly power of our Head Shepherd, Whose people was to be tended and nourished by Him, and by Him confirmed and strengthened, such a Church as this does require an infallible Head by which to be governed, and from which to derive strength and steadiness. In the present section we have shown that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility follows from those passages of the Gospel which contain the full original constitution of the Church, as it was conceived and established by Christ; and we have proved that our doctrine is a necessary consequence of that original constitution. We must then condemn Dr. Pusey's assertion for rashness and absurdity.

But what shall we say of the French Prelate, whose work has just now appeared in Paris,[93] and who seems to take up the same position as Dr. Pusey in his denial of Papal Infallibility? The chief object of his work is avowedly to demonstrate that "ce privilège changerait la nature de la constitution de l'Eglise."[94] In the following sections we shall have occasion to meet the Bishop of Sura in the field of historical facts, which he strives to represent as telling strongly against the doctrine which we maintain. But in the present stage of our argument we do not consider him worthy of a formal refutation. It is true that a whole chapter of his second volume is devoted to the endeavour to weaken the force of the Biblical argument drawn by his opponents from the passages of the Gospel, which we have been lately discussing; but the author does not venture directly and openly to deny the correctness

[93] *Du Concil Général et de la Paix Réligieuse.* Par Mgr. H. L. C. Maret. Paris, 1869.

[94] Op. cit., l. iv., ch. v., n. iii. t. ii., p. 94, and elsewhere *passim.*

of the interpretation given by the champions of Papal Infallibility. He does no more than blame them for quoting these texts—"Sans tenir d'abord compte de l'ensemble des textes analogues, de leurs conséquences légitimes, de l'interprétation que l'Eglise elle-même en donna par les actes des Conciles Généraux et de l'expérience historique."[95] This means that he thinks himself freed from the necessity of demolishing the Biblical demonstration by the assertion that some of the Popes, especially Liberius, Vigilius, Honorius, and Eugenius IV., by solemn Decrees have taught dogmatical error, and consequently he concludes that it must be impossible to draw out from the texts of the Gospel any argument for a position which is contradicted by historical facts. But since we, on the other hand, do not admit that any one of the Popes has ever taught error *ex cathedrâ* in his dogmatical and authentic utterances, therefore we are justified in deriving from the Scripture an argument for the personal infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and morals. Before long we shall undertake, documents in hand, to show that every one of Mgr. Maret's boasted assortment of "historical facts" is a mere calumny, invented in past times by enemies of the Church, in the hope of gaining a hearing for their false tenets and of deceiving the unwary people. We shall go yet further, and show ourselves ready to take full account of the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils and of historical experience, firmly believing that these uncorrupted documents not only confirm and give stability to the Biblical argument in favour of Papal Infallibility, but that they also demonstrate that the constitution of the Church, as established by Christ, necessarily requires the infallibility of the Supreme Head of the Church.

[95] Op. cit., n. i., p. 73.

SECTION III.

PRACTICE OF ANTIQUITY CONSIDERED AS EVINCING PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

FROM the time of the Reformation down to the present day, Protestant writers, both English and German, have frequently and boldly asserted that the theory of Papal Infallibility is of recent date; that this privilege was unheard of up to the time of the separation of East and West; that the claim to it was an invention of the middle ages, originating at the time when the power of the Popes was raised to its height by Gregory VII.;[96] that the claim received developments as time went on, but that it did not assume a formal systematic shape earlier than the sixteenth century. The hope of depreciating the doctrine itself has led some neo-Catholic and Gallican writers to adopt the same line of argument. But an exact study of the records of antiquity will show that these writers are mistaken. Papal Infallibility has been the persuasion of the Church in all ages, from the very origin of the Church itself; for, as we saw in the preceding section, no less is implied in the very words by which the Church was founded upon the primacy of St. Peter. Papal Infallibility is then no mere theological conclusion drawn, like so many doctrines, from revealed principles, and having more or less foundation in Revelation itself; it is a doctrine which has been revealed, directly and immediately, and consequently it has in itself the

[96] See Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.*, vol. iii., pt. iii., d. iii., ch. i., sec. 61, p. 164, and note 12. Edinburgh, 1853.

substance or essence of an article of faith. It is not meant that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility will be found explicitly proposed in the earliest ages of the Church, under a definite form and in the shape which is now familiar. Its shape, and the definite form which it has assumed, is due to doctrinal development, in the same nature as finds place in many other doctrines; but the original persuasion of the truth of the doctrine can be attributed to nothing else but divine revelation. A double task is therefore before us—first, to bring forward the documents which attest that Papal Infallibility was the firm and constant practical persuasion of the Church; secondly, to sketch the historical progress and development of the doctrine, and to point out the phases through which it has passed, the opposition which it has encountered, the triumph which it has achieved. The historical and traditional demonstration which will occupy the present and four following sections, will serve to demonstrate the divine origin of the doctrine; the history of its development, showing the source and origin of the contrary error, will supply an answer to the difficulties raised by Protestant and Gallican controversialists.

Our first argument is founded on the necessity of communion with the Roman See. The common persuasion of antiquity regarded this communion as an indisputable criterion of orthodoxy, so that the want of it was a sure token of heresy or schism. We proved the existence of this persuasion in the first part of the present work, showing that the Roman See was considered as the centre of unity in the Church. Assuming this, we proceed to prove that the persuasion implies a practical persuasion of Papal Infallibility. This follows from a careful consideration of the patristic passages which have been used to show that communion with Rome was the appointed guarantee of unity. Thus we

read in St. Cyprian: "He who forsakes the Chair of St. Peter upon which the Church is built, let him not feel confidence that he is in the Church."[97] The Saint had already said in one of his Letters, that as the Church is one, so the Chair is one, which by Christ's voice was founded upon the rock.[98] The Chair founded upon the rock is the Chair of St. Peter, on whom, as the holy Martyr often teaches, the Church is to be built.[99] St. Cyprian therefore believes that to forsake the unity of the Church is equivalent to forsaking the unity of the Chair, both being founded on the rock of Peter. Now what did St. Cyprian and the other writers of antiquity mean by the word Chair (Cathedra or θρόνος)? There is no doubt that the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, used the word to mean episcopal authority and office, and sometimes the Episcopate itself. But since the principal point in the authority and office of a Bishop consists in his authentic teaching, it follows that the Fathers used the word "chair" to mean principally the authentic teaching, or rather, the doctrine itself which is taught; and this meaning was also familiar to the Jews, and is used by our Lord Himself in the Gospel (Matt. xxiii. 2), of which text St. Jerome gives the following interpretation: "By

[97] S. Cyprianus, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, p. 195. Edit. Baluzii. The words "qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est Ecclesia, deserit," are found not only in the Letter of Pelagius II. to the Bishops of Istria, in the Acts of Alexander III., and in the writings of Ivo and Gratian, but also in the Vatican manuscript of St. Cyprian's works and in four other very ancient English manuscripts, &c. The passage which we quote from the *Epist.* xl. of St. Cyprian confirms the belief that these words are authentic. (See the remarks of Baluce and Pamelius *in loca.*) Nevertheless, from other passages of the same holy Doctor no fair doubt could be entertained as to his belief on this matter.

[98] *Epist.* xl., p. 53. Edit. Baluzii. "Una Ecclesia et Cathedra una super petram Domini voce fundata."

[99] See *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, l. c., and *Epist.* lxxiii. Edit. Bal., p. 131.

chair Christ means the doctrine of the law."[100] And similarly St. Athanasius: "By chair He means doctrine, as He says 'on the chair of Moses.'"[101] And generally the Fathers, when they speak of the "chair," either Episcopal or Pontifical, allude to the Christian doctrine of faith which is taught by the Bishops and by the Popes.[102] We see then that St. Cyprian, in the passages just now quoted uses the word "chair" in the double sense, as implying both the Papal supreme authority and the Papal authentic *magisterium* in the Church. This is further evidenced by the scope of St. Cyprian in writing the treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, which was to explain the reason why our Lord, having given to all the Apostles an equal power, builds the Church upon Peter, in order to manifest unity, and to set the Church before us as One. Peter, living in his Successors, was to preserve the Church in its perfect unity by his supreme power, and by his authentic *magisterium*. Whoever then ceases to be connected with the immoveable centre of unity, or forsakes the clear stream of Apostolic tradition to drink of other waters, has no ground of assurance that he is in the Church. By shaking off the yoke of the Papal authority he has made himself a schismatic; by rejecting, whether wholly or in part, the Papal authentic *magisterium*, he has become a heretic. But this practical maxim inculcated by St. Cyprian rests beyond all question on the persuasion of Papal Infallibility. Without such persuasion, it could not be laid down as a principle on which reliance could in all cases be placed, that to

[100] "Per Cathedram doctrinam legis intelligit" (In l. iv., *In Matt.* xxiii. 2. Op., t. vii., p. 182. Edit. Vallarsii).

[101] S. Athanasius, *In Ps.* i. 1 (Op., t. i., p. 804. Edit. Maur. Patavii, 1777).

[102] See Rev. F. Schrader, S.J., *De Unitate Romanâ*, l. i., cap. iv., sec. ii., n. 1, p. 117. Edit. Friburgi Brisgoviæ, 1862.

forsake the Chair or doctrine of St. Peter was to forsake the Church itself. If the Successors of Peter could ever by possibility teach erroneous doctrine, resistance to them, and, that failing, separation from their communion would become the duty of all the Faithful; when then the Faithful are taught to submit without reserve to the authentic teaching of the Successors of Peter, it is clearly assumed that these could not by possibility teach erroneous doctrine. And thus we are enabled to see the bearing of St. Cyprian's argument,[103] and we understand why he speaks with so much contempt of all the artifices employed by the Novatians against the Apostolical Chair; because, he says, "heretical perfidy cannot have any access to the Romans."[104] By these words he clearly shows the persuasion held by all the Catholics of his age that the *magisterium* of St. Peter's Chair is infallible.

But the doctrine of St. Cyprian was the doctrine of all antiquity. Optatus of Milevis insists on the same principle, and shows the existence of the same persuasion which attributed infallibility to the Apostolic See. He teaches that at Rome an Episcopal Chair was established, and that through this one Chair all were to preserve unity in the Church. Moreover, he continues, he who should raise up another throne against this one Chair would be a schismatic and a sinner; and he concludes, that the whole world was in one fellowship of communion with the Successor of St. Peter.[105] Now how could all the Faithful in the Church preserve unity in the Chair of Rome, except by an unlimited submission to the authority and to the doctrine of the

[103] S. Cyprianus, *Epist.* lii. *ad Antonianum.* Edit. Baluz., p. 66.

[104] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* lv. Edit. Baluz., p. 86.

[105] "In qua una Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur" (S. Optatus Milevitanus, *De Schismate Donatistarum*, l. ii., capp. ii., iii. Edit. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xi., p. 947, seq.).

Apostolic See? And this implies that the privilege of infallibility had been intrusted to it. If all antiquity was persuaded that, according to the divine economy, the Successor of St. Peter had been appointed to keep unity in the Church by the teaching of his supreme *magisterium*, that *magisterium* must have been held in the common persuasion as infallible. If all antiquity believed that whoever followed a doctrine contrary to the teaching of the Roman See would at once become a schismatic and a sinner, it must have been believed at the same time that the teaching of that See was the infallible reflection of the Eternal Truth. No other is the principle implied by St. Jerome when he wrote to Pope Damasus: "I cry aloud—'If any one is united to the Chair of Peter, he is mine,'" and therefore he besought the Pope to let him know with whom he ought to hold communion in Syria.[106] The controversy which then rent the Church of Antioch into three parts turned on a doctrinal question concerning the Divine Nature and Substance. St. Jerome thinks it necessary to apply to the Chair of St. Peter,[107] that is to say, to Pope Damasus, because he was persuaded that after Christ he ought to follow no one before the Pope, by joining whom he would be assured of being in communion with St. Peter's Chair, beyond the limits of whose communion none were found but the *profane*.[108] All this reveals the long-standing belief of St. Jerome

[106] "Ego clamito, si quis cathedræ Petri jungitur, meus est . . . Idcirco obtestor Beatitudinem vestram . . . ut mihi litteris tuis, apud quem in Syria debeam communicare, significes" (*Epist.* xvi. *ad Damasum Papam*, n. 2. Op., t. i., p. 43. Edit. Vallarsii).

[107] "Ideo mihi cathedram Petri . . . censui consulendam" (*Epist.* xv. *ad Damasum Papam*, n. 1. Op., l. c., p. 38).

[108] "Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens, Beatitudini tuæ, idest cathedræ Petri, communione consocior. Super illam Petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit, prophanus est" (*Epist.* xv., cit., n. 2, p. 39).

in the Infallibility of the Successor of St. Peter, especially as he solemnly professes that he would submit to the Pope's decision, even if it were in favour of the opinion which he had set himself to refute. "Decernite," he says to Damasus, "obsecro, si placet, et non timebo tres hypostases dicere.[109] The holy Doctor would not hesitate to admit a dogmatical expression, which previously he had constantly refused to recognise, if only Pope Damasus would admit it. The reason must be that the decision of the Pope was regarded by him as an oracle of St. Peter's Chair, whose communion was the essential character of orthodoxy. In fact, in his controversy with Rufinus, he does not appeal to any other test of orthodoxy than the doctrine of the Apostolic See. For he tells his adversary that if he would consent to agree with the Roman See they would both be Catholics.[110] This is as much as to say that to be a Catholic and to adhere to the doctrine of the Roman See are identically one and the same idea. But this doctrine would be untrue if heresy and error could possibly have any access to the Chair of St. Peter, or if this could fail even for a time to be the infallible organ of Christ.

A view precisely the same was held by that other great Doctor of the Church, St. Ambrose. He proclaimed the maxim, which was received all over the Church, that "they who do not hold to St. Peter's Chair cannot have any portion in St. Peter's inheritance."[111] He teaches that "to hold communion with the Catholic

[109] *Epist.* xv., cit., n. 4, pp. 40, 41.

[110] "Fidem suam quam vocat? . . . Si Romanam responderit, ergo Catholici sumus" (*Contra Rufinum*, l. i., n. 4. Op., t. ii., pt. i., p. 461. Edit. Vallarsii).

[111] *De Pœnitentia*, l. i., cap. vii. n. 33 (Op., t. ii., p. 399). "Non habent Petri hæreditatem qui Petri sedem non habent." Those who read "qui Petri *fidem* non habent," suit our purpose still better.

Bishops means nothing else than to hold it with the Roman Church."[112] And, moreover, he expressed the same idea in a most pointed manner when saying—"Where Peter is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is no death, but eternal life."[113] Now the foregoing passages of the great Doctor reveal nothing else than what was the common persuasion of antiquity—that the Roman Chair was not only the centre of authority and jurisdiction in the Church, but also the infallible organ of Catholic doctrine. No other meaning can be ascribed to the saying that being Catholic implies agreeing with the Roman Church. Unquestionably to be a Catholic imports two things. First, to believe the whole doctrine which is believed in the Church of Christ; secondly, to be subject to the supreme jurisdiction of the Vicar of Christ in the unity of one body. He who is wanting in the former property is a heretic; he who does not possess the latter is a schismatic. But St. Ambrose, with all antiquity, doubted not that he who agreed with the Roman See was unequivocally a Catholic; they must, then, have had a deeply-rooted conviction that he who agrees with the Roman Church not only satisfies the second condition of being connected with the centre of Catholic authority, but also that he likewise fulfils the first concerning Catholic doctrine. And this evidently implies the persuasion of Papal Infallibility. It could not be said absolutely that he who admits the doctrine of the Apostolic See is essentially Catholic and orthodox in his doctrine unless the doctrine of the Apostolic See be essentially Catholic and orthodox. And such an *à priori* argument concerning the orthodoxy of that See can have no ground but the conviction of its infallibility.

[112] *Sermo de Excessu fratris sui Satyri*, l. i., n. 47 (Op., t. ii., p. 1127).

[113] Enarr., *In Ps.* xl., n. 30 (Op., t. i., p. 879).

Again, that essential link of connection between Peter and the Church, as pointed out by St. Ambrose, necessarily conveys the idea of Papal Infallibility. For the true Church is there, where Peter and his Successors, with their authority and their doctrine, are found, and it is evident that the immaculate dove of the Church could not possibly be connected with an institution which is in itself liable to error and heresy. Therefore the holy Doctor rightly denounces the Novatians as heretics, because they had broken asunder their communion with St. Peter's See.

The illustrious African Doctor, St. Augustine, who was regarded in his age as an oracle of Catholic doctrine, clearly attests the fact on which we are insisting. He lays down the universal maxim that he who does not hold communion with the Roman Pontiffs cannot be a Catholic, nor have any claim to that honourable name. In fact, this is the principal argument which he urges against the Donatists when proving that they were cut off from the Church of Christ. After having enumerated the Popes from St. Peter down to the then reigning Pontiff, Anastasius, he remarks that "in that catalogue no Donatist Bishop is found."[114] Whence he concludes that his adversaries were separated from the Church, so that there was no hope for them unless they were again engrafted upon the root.[115] It seems that St. Augustine is here alluding

[114] *Epist.* liii. *ad Generosum*, cap. i., n. 2 (Op., t. ii., p. 196. Edit. Migne).

[115] St. Augustine calls the Donatists on that account *præcisos.* "Unda illis parum est, quod præcisos esse non pudet, nec sibi subveniant, ut cum possint, nisi etiam secum alios præcidere, et sicut ligna arida in ignem destinare conentur" (*Ibid.*, n. 1). Therefore he exhorts Generosus not to listen to them who "illum a toto præcidere et in partem contrudere conantur et alienare a promissis Dei" (*Ibid.*). As reason for this he subjoins the argument referred to in the text.

to St. Cyprian's expression, who called the Roman See *Ecclesiarum matricem et radicem.* Consequently, as a branch must wither away if torn from the root, so a Christian must forfeit the character of Catholic if cut off from the Roman Chair. In accordance with this teaching, the same Doctor brings the charge of impiety and arrogance against those who do not submit to the supreme authority of the Roman See. And he rests his assertion on two principles; first, the necessity of faith for the purpose of gaining wisdom and attaining salvation; secondly, the necessity of an authentic *magisterium,* in order to understand the Scripture and learn the revealed doctrine. Now he argues that nobody can possess faith if he resist the authority of the Apostolic Roman See, and nobody can have true knowledge of the doctrine of the Scriptures unless he receive it at the hands of the Apostolic Church itself.[116] We gather from this the belief of St. Augustine, that the Church of Rome and the Pope who sits in St. Peter's Chair are infallible in their definitions. And observe the reason for which, when arguing against Julian the Pelagian, he says that it was not worth while to appeal to the Oriental Fathers. Because, he remarks, they are Christians, and the faith both of the East and of the West is only one. But the means by which he professes to know what was the faith of all the Church with regard to the Pelagian controversy, is the authentic

[116] *De Utilitate credendi,* cap. xvii., n. 35 (Op., t. viii., p. 91. Edit. Migne). "Cui (Apostolicæ Sedi) nolle primas dare vel summæ profecto impietatis est, vel præcipitis arrogantiæ. Nam si nulla certa ad sapientiam salutemque animis via est, nisi cum eos rationi præcolit fides; quid est aliud ingratum esse opi atque auxilio divino quam tanto labore prædictæ auctoritati velle resistere? Et si unaquæque disciplina quanquam vilis et facilis ut recipi possit doctorem atque magistrum requirit, quid temerariæ superbiæ plenius quam divinorum sacramentorum libros et ab interpretibus suis nolle cognoscere et incognitos velle damnare?"

definition of the Pope. Therefore, "I think," he goes on, "that that part of the world should have been sufficient to thee in which the Lord was pleased to crown with a most glorious martyrdom the first of His Disciples. That if you had been willing to listen to the blessed Innocent who presided over that Church, you would have preserved your unwary youth from the nets laid for you by the Pelagians. For what other doctrine could that holy man forward in his answer to the African Synods, if not that which from the first ages the Apostolic See and the Roman Church, in accord with the other Churches throughout the world, hold with unchangeableness."[117] Now the Infallibility of the Pope is the only reason why he could not pronounce any sentence in the matter except what was in conformity with the doctrine of antiquity and of the Universal Church. So that his authentic definitions cannot in any manner disagree from the sentence of antiquity and of the whole Church, because both are due to the same identical supernatural assistance of the Spirit of God, Who leads the Church into the path of truth and preserves it from any shade of error. But before the final definitive sentence of the Pope, we cannot infallibly know what is the doctrine of the Universal Church. In order to prove that this is really the view taken by the holy Doctor on the doctrine of the Papal Infallibility, we will call the attention of our readers to the judgment passed by St. Augustine on the definitive condemnation of the Pelagians issued by Pope Innocent I. As early as the year 416 the heresies of Pelagius had been condemned by two African Synods, which had sent their sentence to the Roman See, but the Pontiff had not yet pronounced his final judgment. Well, in the meantime St. Augustine wrote to Bishop

[117] *Contra Julianum Pelagianum*, l. i., cap. iv., nn. 13, 14 (Op., t. ix., p. 648. Edit. Migne).

Hilary on the subject of the Pelagian heresies. In his letter he mentions that at the time two African Councils had already proscribed that new heresy, and that letters asking for the confirmation of the decision had been dispatched to Rome; he declares that the heresy was hostile to the grace of Christ, and had risen up in opposition to His Church.[118] Nevertheless, he pointedly asserts that the heretics "were not yet *evidently* separated from the Church."[119] Now St. Augustine knew well that the Pelagian error was against the Church of Christ, that is to say, against its doctrine and its faith. He was likewise aware that the heresy had been condemned by several Councils, and yet he asserts that it was not yet evident whether the heresy was severed from Christ's Church. Whence was the light to shine that would make the separation evident? Undoubtedly from the supreme and definite judgment of the Pope. In fact, as soon as Innocent I. in 417 sent his final sentence to the African Bishops, St. Augustine changed his tone. In one of his sermons to the people he solemnly denounced the new heretics, and urged upon the Faithful no longer to show them a sinful mercy. "Fratres mei," he says, ". . . ubi tales inveneritis, occultare nolite. Redarguite contradicentes, et resistentes ad nos perducite."[120] And what is the ground of this firm and bold language? He shall give us his own answer. "Jam enim de hac causa duo concilia missa sunt ad Sedem Apostolicam, inde etiam rescripta venerunt. Causa finita est."[121] In other words, the

[118] *Epist.* clxxviii. *ad Hilarium Ep.*, nn. 1, 2 (Op., t. ii., p. 773. Edit. Migne).

[119] "Nova quædam hæresis inimica gratiæ Christi contra Ecclesiam Christi conatur exsurgere; sed nondum evidenter ab Ecclesia separata" (*Ibid.*, n. 1).

[120] *Serm.* cxxxi., n. x., n. 10 (Op., t. v., p. 734. Migne).

[121] L. c.

decision of Innocent I. brought the cause to an end, and dispelled any doubt whatever as to the Pelagian sect being evidently separated from the Church. Now evidence of this sort could not be created by a final decision of the Pope unless the decision bore the character of an infallible utterance. In conclusion, then, St. Augustine, in inculcating the necessity of communion of faith with the Roman See, acted upon the firm persuasion that the Roman See was the incorruptible source of Catholic doctrine.

But we need not wonder that the Fathers mentioned above speak so clearly in favour of the universal persuasion of Christian antiquity, that no orthodoxy could ever exist unless in communion of faith with the Roman See; and that this necessity is the result of that See being the authentic infallible source of the Catholic teaching. That doctrine had been fully acknowledged from the very beginning of Christianity, and stated in an irrefragable manner by St. Irenæus, whose master, St. Polycarp, was a disciple of the Apostles. His doctrine, it cannot be doubted, was the doctrine of the Apostles, especially in whatever concerns the organisation of the Church and its original *magisterium.* St. Epiphanius did not hesitate to call him the admirable and blessed Successor of the Apostles, filled with gifts of the Holy Ghost.[122] Now this learned Doctor of the Church, after having laid down the great dogmatic principle, testified by the whole of antiquity, that the unequivocal test of orthodoxy consists in the doctrine being found in the Apostolic Churches and transmitted by the continual succession of the Bishops,[123] points out that the teaching of the Apostolic Churches must

[122] S. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxiv., n. 8; xxxi., n. 33 (Op., t. i., p. 73. Edit. Petavii).

[123] *Contra Hæreses*, l. iii., cap. iii., n. 1, p. 175. Edit. Massueti. "Traditionem itaque Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in

necessarily be in accord with that of the Roman See. He reasons as follows: We have no need to number up the successions of the Bishops of all the Apostolical Churches in order to confound the enemies of the faith; we may overpower them by merely setting forth the succession of the Roman Bishops, who have laid down the immaculate doctrine intrusted to them by the Apostles Peter and Paul, and consecrated with their blood."[124] To justify this assertion, he continues: "Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio"[125]—"For with this Church, on account of its predominant authority, every Church must necessarily agree; that is to say, the Faithful throughout the world; for in it the tradition which comes from the Apostles has ever been preserved by all Christians." This classical passage of so learned and so ancient a Father affords us one of the most evident proofs of the universal persuasion of the Papal Infallibility. The proposition of St. Irenæus is certainly not merely historical; it contains the enunciation of a principle. He does not say that all the Churches agree with the traditional doctrine of the Roman Church; but that

omni Ecclesia adest respicere omnibus qui vera velint videre; et habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi et successores eorum usque ad nos," &c.

[124] "Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis Traditionem, et annuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquomodo, vel per sibi placentia, vel vanam gloriam," &c. (l. c., n. 2).

[125] *Ibid.*, pp. 175, 176.

all ought to agree with it necessarily and as a duty. Again, he adds that the Faithful scattered all over the world, steadily hold the true Apostolic tradition, because they keep united with the Roman See. That is to say, the Roman Church is the head fountain of the Apostolic doctrine; so that whoever submits to its *magisterium* is certain to receive the doctrines of the Apostles. This is, in fact, a solemn profession of the Infallibility of the Roman See. Unless the Roman See were the infallible organ of the Apostolic teaching, we could not be certain that to hold to the Roman doctrine is to hold to the orthodox faith; and, therefore, if all the Faithful are bound to hold to the Roman doctrine, the reason must be that the Roman See is the divinely appointed centre of unity in faith. And let us remark, that St. Irenæus, while laying down the dogmatic maxim that the Apostolic doctrine is that which is held by the Apostolic Churches handed down to us by the regular successions of their Bishops, referred to the Roman Church alone, among so many Churches of Apostolic foundation, as the centre of union in faith. Why is this? The reason is, that each of the Apostolic Churches, taken by itself, is liable to error and heresy, therefore a partial separation from them may sometimes be a duty for Catholics; while the only Church inaccessible to error and heresy is the Roman. On this account all the Faithful and all the Churches are bound to be in communion of faith with this one Church in order to secure infallibly the possession of the Apostolical doctrine. Again, why in the teaching of St. Irenæus is the Roman Church alone endowed with this supernatural prerogative? The reason is plainly assigned—"propter potiorem principalitatem;" not merely on account of a special exercise of divine liberality, but principally because of the Papal Primacy established at Rome by the fact of St. Peter founding there his

Episcopal See and retaining it until death. Protestants and ultra-Gallicans have long endeavoured to adulterate the meaning of the word *principalitatem* in the foregoing passage, and they have been encouraged by the circumstance that the loss of the original Greek text gives a wide scope for conjecture. But there is no need to notice here the many fanciful interpretations which have been put forward in the hope of weakening the force of the testimony. A parallel passage of the same holy Doctor will at once suffice to show the purport of the Latin word, and help us to guess what term the writer employed in his original text. In the fourth book he speaks as follows: "Sic principalitatem quidem habet in omnibus Deus, quoniam et solus infectus et prior omnium, et omnibus, ut sint, ipse est causa; reliqua vera omnia in subjectione manent Dei."[126] In the Greek text, which still survives, the phrase in question is expressed by the words—*πρωτεύει ἐν πᾶσιν ὁ Θεός.*

Now, according to St. Irenæus, God possesses that supreme principality over all creatures, because being eternal He had not His origin from them, and He gave them origin by the power of His creative word. It follows that the word *principalitas*, applied to the Roman Church, implies not only that this Church is by itself the first authentic and original Church of Christ, but also that it gives origin and beginning to the others by engrafting them in the unity of Christ's Body. The words which St. Irenæus used in the disputed passage having probably been—*διὰ τὸ ἱκανώτερον πρωτεῖον.* And this view is confirmed by the judgment of a great scholar, certainly no friend of Roman claims, Salmasius, who believed that the word *principalitas* must have been expressed by St. Irenæus by the word *πρωτεῖον.* In using this expression the holy Doctor said no more than St. Cyprian said in Africa, when

[126] Op. cit., l. iv., cap. xxxviii., n. 3, pp. 284, 285.

he called the Roman Church *Ecclesiam principalem*,[127] or when he termed it *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem et matricem*,[128] or when he styled it the source *Unde sacerdotalis unitas exorta est*.[129] St. Irenæus, then, meant by that word the supreme authority of the Pope in the very sense in which it is understood by Catholics. His reasoning, then, comes to this: Every Church must necessarily agree with the faith of the Roman Church, because of its supreme authority, by which it is the infallible organ of the Catholic truth, and the great pattern of Apostolic doctrine which it is necessary to believe. But all that is here said refers to the Pope, since Rome would not be above the level of other Apostolic Churches unless St. Peter had there founded the Chair of a supreme infallible authority; and, accordingly, the writer immediately subjoins the catalogue of the Roman Pontiffs in order, and he closes the list by these memorable words — "By this order and this succession, both that tradition, which is in the Church from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us. And this is the most complete demonstration that the vivifying faith is one and the same, which from the Apostles even until now, has been preserved in the Church, and transmitted in truthfulness."[130] In these words St. Irenæus plainly asserts (1.) that the Church of Rome, through the organ of the Popes, is the source from which we receive the Apostolic doctrine; (2.) that the doctrinal *magisterium*

[127] *Epist.* lv., p. 86. Edit. Baluzii.

[128] *Epist.* xlv., p. 59.

[129] *Epist.* lv., l. c.

[130] *Contra Hæreses*, l. iii., cap. iii., n. 3, p. 176. Τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διαδοχῇ ἥ τε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ παράδοσις, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυγμα κατήντηκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς. "Et est plenissima hæc ostensio, unam et eamdem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in Ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate."

of the Popes is a sufficient argument to show that the vivifying faith handed down from the Apostles is really one and the same, and is transmitted in truthfulness. In other words, St. Irenæus attributes to the Roman Church alone, and to the Popes by name, the characteristic prerogatives which belong to the Universal Church taken in its entirety. Should all the Apostolic Churches unanimously attest a doctrine through the successions of their Bishops, and teach it as revealed, no doubt could possibly be entertained that that doctrine was a part of Revelation, and transmitted truthfully. The reason of this is plain. It is that the Church as a whole is infallible, and no other reason can possibly be admitted as sufficient. In the same manner, if the *magisterium* of the Roman Pontiffs alone, teaching from St. Peter's Chair, renders us certain as to the doctrines laid down by the Apostles, these Pontiffs must be infallible in their teaching, and nothing short of this infallibility can possibly account for this certainty. Such is the purport of this classical passage, which all the efforts of the Reformation and of Gallicanism have not been able to explain away.

We have here the reason why all Christian antiquity was so anxious to keep the order and succession of the Roman Pontiffs. St. Epiphanius, after having numbered the list of the Popes from St. Peter down to his age, remarks that no one must wonder that he had gone through the successions of the Roman Pontiffs with so great diligence; "because," he continues, "it is through them that the truth is pointed out."[131] According then to the Fathers, the reason for which the Catholics ought to be in communion of faith with the Roman Pontiffs, is because through their *magisterium* the truth

[131] S. Epiphanius, *Adversus Hæreses*, hær. xxvii., n. 6 (Op., t. i., p. 107. Edit. Pat.). *Καὶ μή τις θαυμάσῃ ὅτι ἕκαστα οὕτως ἀκριβῶς διήλθομεν· διὰ γὰρ τούτων ἀεὶ τὸ σαφὲς δείκνυται.*

(τὸ σαφές) of the faith is made manifest; and, consequently, whoever should disagree from them would disagree from the truth, and hold society with the father of errors and lies. But if the Fathers were persuaded that the truth of faith flows from the authentic teaching of the Roman Pontiffs, they must have been beyond doubt persuaded that infallibility was the prerogative of the Roman Chair and of its Bishops. Theodoret spoke still more explicitly of the Roman See and of the Popes. "That most holy See," he says, "of all the Churches of the world has on manifold titles the primacy, and, above all, it has always been preserved from heretical defilement, nor has the See been held by any person who has maintained opinions contrary to faith; but it has always retained in its integrity the Apostolic grace."[132] The Apostolic See is then entirely free from error, and the Popes are the authentic organs of truth. In accordance with this doctrine, Theodoret himself addressed his celebrated letter to Pope Leo I., whom he requested to pronounce his solemn dogmatic sentence, whether or not the doctrine of Theodoret was in accord with the doctrine of the Apostolic See.[133] For this, and this alone, was felt to be the unequivocal test of orthodoxy. This practical principle was so widespread, and was held so firmly in all antiquity, that communion with the Roman Chair was regarded beyond any exception as the unmistakable mark of orthodox faith. Hence came the custom, so common in the first ages of the Church, of the Letters of communion, which the Greeks called κανονικὰ γράμματα, or κανονικὰς ἐπιστολάς, and the Latins *Litteræ Formatæ.* The Popes never granted testimonial Letters of this nature before having received from the

[132] Theodoretus, Ep. Cyri, *Epist.* cxvi. (Op., t. iv., p. 1323, seq. Edit. Migne).

[133] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* cxiii. *Leoni Episcopo Romæ* (l. c., p. 1315).

applicant a full profession of the faith as held at Rome. The Letters were not, therefore, merely a sign of being in communion of charity and disciplinary obedience with the Roman See, but principally and expressly a sign of holding the orthodox faith. We will give one instance to show how deep and practical an impression this principle had made, in an early age, upon the minds of men. When the Emperor Gratian came to the determination of giving back to the Catholics the churches wrested from them by his Arian predecessor, he decreed that they should be restored to those who were in communion with Pope Damasus.[134] But since a certain Paulinus, concealing the erroneous principles which he held, claimed a church on the ground that he was in communion with the Pope, a Priest named Flavian questioned him with the view of bringing his hypocrisy to light: "If you," he said, "embrace the communion of Pope Damasus, show to us that your doctrine is in perfect agreement with that held by him."[135] The Faithful were persuaded that there could be no communion with Rome without unity in faith.

The same truth is clearly proved from the professions of faith, imposed from time to time by the Popes on the Oriental Church, after schism. It will be sufficient to mention those only of Pope Hormisdas after the Acacian schism, and of Clement IV., proposed to the Emperor Palæologus, and read in the Second Council of Lyons. All who subscribe the first of these promise that they will follow the Apostolic See in everything, and will profess whatever this See ordains.[136]

[134] Theodoretus, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. v., cap. ii. (Op., t. iii., p. 1197. Edit. cit.).

[135] Εἰ τὴν Δαμάσου κοινωνίαν ἀσπάζῃ, ἐπίδειξον ἡμῖν σαφῶς τὴν τῶν δογμάτων συγγένειαν (*Ibid.*, cap. iii., p. 1201).

[136] "Unde sicut prædiximus sequentes in omnibus Apostolicam Sedem et prædicantes ejus omnia constituta; spero, ut in una

This profession of faith was accepted by all the Patriarchs of the Oriental Church, and afterwards, in the Eighth General Synod, by all the Fathers there assembled, Latin and Greek.[137] Moreover, in the same Synod, when the two Photian Bishops, Theophilus and Zacharias, applied to the Council for reconciliation with the Church, the Legates of Rome said that they should sign the two *Libelli* which it was usual for all to sign who wished to be admitted to communion with Rome. The first document bound them to hold the Catholic truth according to the rule of the Church; the second, to follow in all things the judgment of the Roman Church. And since the Photians refused to accept the Letter, they were rejected by the Council and deprived of Catholic communion.[138] In the profession of faith of which we spoke above, the Oriental Church declared their belief that all controversies of faith should be defined by the Pope,[139] and that all the Church was bound to follow his decision. Many other professions of faith to the same effect could be adduced, but to do so would lead to needless repetition. What we have given is amply sufficient to prove our point beyond question.

communione vobiscum, quam Sedes Apostolica prædicat, esse merear, in qua est integra et verax Christianæ religionis soliditas. Promittens etiam sequestratos a communione Ecclesiæ Catholicæ idest non consentientes Sedi Apostolicæ, eorum nomina inter sacra non esse recitanda mysteria." See this formula in Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symb. et Defin.*, n. xx., p. 50. Edit. iv. Wirceburgi, 1865. In the following sections we must subject this passage to further examination.

[137] Conc. Constantinop. iv., Œccum. viii., Act. iv. (Labbe, t. x., p. 811); *Ex versione Anastasii Bibli.*, p. 516.

[138] L. c.

[139] "Sicut præ cæteris tenetur (Romanus Pontifex) fidei veritatem defendere; sic et si quæ de fide subortæ fuerint quæstiones, suo debent judicio definiri," &c. (Profes. fidei Michaelis Palæologi, in Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, n. lix.. p. 170).

Our argument in this section authorises us to conclude against Protestants and Gallicans that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was the persuasion of all Christian antiquity. For all antiquity agreed in holding the four points—(1.) That communion with the Pope was essential to the character of Catholic; (2.) that communion with the Pope implied communion with his belief and teaching; (3.) that the faith of the Apostolic See was the pattern of the faith of all the world, and its teaching the source of all the pure Apostolic doctrine; hence (4.) all who communicated with that See and held its doctrine were evidently orthodox in their faith, and in unity with the whole Church. And it is evidently impossible to admit these four points and yet join with Protestants and Gallicans in rejecting Papal Infallibility. As to the distinction imagined between the Roman See and the Roman Pontiff, we shall find hereafter a more fitting occasion to show its baselessness. For the moment this section is an ample refutation of what Mgr. Maret endeavours to prove. (See the fourth chapter of book iv. of his work mentioned above.)

SECTION IV.

INFALLIBILITY CLAIMED BY THE POPES FROM THE BEGINNING.

In this section we will set forth the claims to infallibility made by the Popes from the earliest ages down to the schism of the Eastern Church. But we must observe at the outset that their right that these claims should be admitted, does not arise from the personal honesty and holiness of all, nor from the learning which was possessed by many. It is true that these considerations are in themselves a sufficient refutation of the rash and calumnious assertion of Febronius and his party, that we cannot rely upon human and suspicious testimonies of the Popes when speaking in favour of their own power and exaggerating their prerogatives. But our argument has another basis. We regard the Popes, when claiming infallibility, as the authentic representatives of the Church, as its Supreme Teachers and Doctors: titles which are attributed to them by Fathers and Councils. We regard them as expressing that Apostolical tradition of which the Church has always been the witness. In a word, the Popes claimed what the Church believed, and their claims were the expression of the judgment and sentiment of the Church itself. This is the reason for which their claims met with no complaints, but with adherence and submission on the part of the Clergy and of the people alike. And people and Clergy of every rank, and even General Councils, referred all controversies of faith to them, and submitted to their decisions as to divine oracles. Now let us examine the claims.

made by the Popes in different ages, stating their prerogative of infallibility.

We reserve to a following section the Letter of Pope St. Damasus to Paulinus of Antioch, in which the doctrinal wisdom, characteristic of the Popes, so plainly appears, and which afforded a bulwark against the heresies by which the East was at that time ravaged.[140] We will begin with Innocent I. (402—417). The two Councils of Carthage and of Milevis had pronounced their sentence of condemnation against the Pelagian doctrine, but they sent their Decree to Innocent I. for confirmation, that it might carry with it an infallible and irresistible authority. Pope Innocent, in his Letter to the Synod of Carthage, commends their conduct, "because," he says, "the Fathers of the Church, acting upon divine, not human, principles, have ordained that no matter of importance which has arisen even in the most distant provinces of the Church, should be finally disposed of until it has been referred to the Apostolic See, that the just sentence might be confirmed by the weight of its authority. For from the Roman Church all Churches must learn the doctrine to which they must cleave, and what they must abhor, as streams are derived from the fountain-head and carry the pure water to all the regions of the world."[141] Similar language is used by the same Pope in a Letter addressed to the Council of Milevis, where he solemnly asserts that the final and definitive sentence on *Causæ Majores*, and especially on controversies of faith,[142] is to be pronounced by

[140] *Epist.* v. *Damasi Pap. ad Paul. Patr. Ant.* (Coustant, p. 507).

[141] *Epist.* xxix., n. 1 (Coustant, pp. 888, 889).

[142] The *Causæ Majores* which were to be referred to the Roman Pontiff, comprehended, first of all, controversies of faith; secondly, all other ecclesiastical causes which were of difficult solution. Innocent mentions the former when he says—"Præsertim quoties fidei ratio ventilatur." But he mentions the latter when he remarks —"Super anxiis rebus quæ sit tenenda sententia."

the Apostolic See.[143] Now in these two Letters Pope Innocent clearly expresses his view that the Roman See is that head of incorrupt waters, that pure and most limpid fountain, from which the Universal Church must draw the Apostolic doctrine; and therefore he orders that all affairs of importance, and principally all controversies of faith, should be referred to his See. What is the meaning of this, if it be not a solemn proclamation of his infallibility? His words remind us of the *ob potiorem principalitatem* of St. Irenæus, on account of which all the Churches are bound to adhere in faith to the Roman See, and to derive from it the Apostolic doctrine. Innocent I. solemnly declares that the streams of divine doctrine which flow to the different countries of the world are pure, that they spring out from the Roman See as from their original source, and that this See is the immaculate fountain. The Roman See, then, cannot be liable to error, otherwise the waters of doctrine which flow from it into all the Church would be infected with error, and would defile the whole Church. The centre must be immaculate, that the whole Church may share in its prerogative. In such words did that great Pope assert the infallibility of his See in its doctrinal utterances; nor had he any thought of exaggerating his authority beyond its natural limits, or beyond the bounds allowed by the persuasion of the Universal Church. With such veneration, in fact, were his principles received by the Bishops of Africa, and so vividly did tradition keep up the memory of them, that 200 years later they copied these very words of Innocent I. in a synodical letter addressed to Pope Theodore, in which they bore witness to his infallible authority.[144]

[143] *Epist.* xxx., n. 2 (Coustant, p. 896).

[144] That synodical letter is to be found in the Council of Lateran, held under Martin I. in 649, Secret. ii. (Labbe, *Conc.*, t. vii., p. 131. Edit. Venet.).

Pope Zosimus (417—418), immediate successor of Innocent I., expresses the same sentiments. "The tradition of the Fathers," he wrote to the Synod of Carthage, "attributed such an authority to the Apostolic See, that its judgments were to be disputed by no man, and such has always been the law and the practice of the Church." And he goes on to say that "exactly the same authority was given to them who were divinely destined to receive the inheritance of this See." And again he inculcates that "such an authority was granted to the Popes, that no one could withhold assent to our decision."[145] Thus Pope Zosimus wrote to the African Bishops on March 21, 418, and the Synod not only concurred in his Declaration, but also forwarded to him for confirmation the Decrees which it had enacted against the Pelagian faction. And as soon as these were approved by Zosimus, says St. Prosper, that heresy was condemned in all the world.[146] St. Augustine, likewise, speaking of the Letter of Zosimus which bears the title of *Tractoria*, by which the Pelagian error was condemned, remarks that in the words of the Apostolic See the Catholic faith appears so ancient, so certain, and so clear, that it is impossible for a Christian to doubt it.[147] This transaction affords us a clear proof of Papal Infallibility. It is claimed by the Pope and acknowledged by the Catholic world. The controversy which gave occasion to the African Synod was one of

[145] *Epist.* xii. *ad Aurelium et Conc. Carthag.*, n. 1 (Coustant, pp. 974, 975). "Patrum traditio Apostolicæ Sedi auctoritatem tantam tribuerit, ut de ejus judicio disceptare nullus auderet, idque per canones semper regulasque servaverit . . . par potestatis data conditio in eos, qui Sedis hereditatem ipso annuente (Domino) meruerunt. . . . Cum tantum nobis esset auctoritatis ut nullus de nostra possit retractare sententia," &c.

[146] In *Chronicon an.* 418 (Op., t. i., p. 741. Edit. Parisiis, 1701).

[147] *Epist.* cxc. *ad Optatum*, cap. vi., n. 23 (Op., t. ii., p. 865. Edit. Migne).

doctrine and faith, and yet Zosimus strongly denounces those who should dare to discuss the judgment of the Holy See, or to refuse assent to it; he frankly and solemnly declares the irreformability of his decisions, and consequently their infallibility. Again, he rests on the Apostolical tradition as the ground of prerogatives which belong to the authority divinely intrusted to him. And he speaks of his infallible authority in the most explicit and absolute manner, and, what is more, he does so while addressing a body of Bishops assembled in Synod. In the meanwhile, they not only listen to his solemn Declaration without the least remark, but prove their adherence by the fact of submitting their Decrees against the Pelagians to his final decision. Again, Xystus III. (432—440), successor of Pope Celestine I., used no different language when proclaiming his supreme infallible authority. When peace and harmony were restored between St. Cyril and the Patriarch of Antioch after the great Council of Ephesus, this Pope addressed a congratulatory Letter to the latter Prelate. He bears witness to the joy of the whole Church at the return of the Patriarch to Catholic union, and praises him on account of his profession of faith in opposition to the Nestorian heresies. After this he goes on as follows: "You have learned by the result of this business what it is to agree in sentiments with us. The blessed Apostle St. Peter, in his Successors, has handed down what he received. Who would separate himself from the doctrine of him whom the Master Himself declared to be the first among the Apostles?"[148] Now by these words Pope Xystus asserts two fundamental points, which necessarily imply Papal Infallibility. He teaches that the *magisterium* of the Popes is the identical *magisterium* of St. Peter, and that their doctrine is his doctrine as laid down by them. Consequently, he

[148] *Epist.* vi. *Xysti ad Joan. Antioch.*, n. 5 (Coustant, p. 1260).

concludes that whoever does not sincerely agree with their doctrine rejects the doctrine of St. Peter himself. But how could it be said that the doctrine of the Popes is identical with that of St. Peter—just as if St. Peter himself were teaching—if the Popes were not infallible in handing it down without the least defilement? Unquestionably it could not be asserted that separation from the doctrine of the Popes is equivalent to separation from the doctrine of St. Peter, unless the Popes were the authentic infallible organ of the Apostolical teaching. No question can be raised as to this conclusion by any who are acquainted with the divine organisation of the Church.

The great Pope Leo I. (440—461), no less than his predecessors and his successors, furnishes clear evidence of the Catholic persuasion of Papal Infallibility. He not only inculcates that the Roman See had never been profaned with heresy—this exemption being due to the teaching of the Holy Ghost[149]—but, furthermore, he asserts that "the firmness of that faith, which was commended in the Chief of the Apostles, is everlasting, and as what Peter confessed in Christ is permanent, so also is what Christ *instituted in Peter*."[150] "Because," he adds, "that solidity which Peter himself, made a rock, received from Christ, the principal Rock, has passed onward to his heirs also and successors."[151] And on this account he maintains that St. Peter speaks through his lips, and that Peter preaches what he taught.[152]

[149] S. Leo, *Sermo* xcvi., cap. iii. (Op., t. i., p. 374. Edit. Ball.).

[150] *Ibid.*, *Sermo* iii., cap. ii. (l. c., p. 12). "Soliditas illius fidei quæ in Apostolorum fide est laudata, perpetua est; et sicut permanet quod in Christo Petrus credidit, ita permanet quod in Petro Christus instituit."

[151] "Soliditas illa quam de petra Christo, etiam ipse petra factus accepit, in suos quoque se transfudit hæredes."

[152] S. Leo, *Sermo* iii., cap. iv. (l. c., p. 13).

And, in accordance with this doctrine, he intimates to the Fathers assembled at Chalcedon that they should abstain from any debate concerning the mystery of the Incarnation of our Lord, since it had been sufficiently declared in the dogmatic Letter which he had sent to the Patriarch Flavian.[153] And he adds that on this account he rejoices that what God had defined through his ministry the Universal Church assembled at Chalcedon had received, as if to manifest the perfect agreement of the members with the head.[154] In the following section we shall adduce some further passages from the works of St. Leo, all proving the same point. For the moment we must be satisfied with what has been just said, which suffices to prove the depth of the conviction entertained by this great Pope of his own prerogative of infallibility, and the distinctness with which he put forward his claim, whether he was addressing the people of Rome or the Universal Church assembled in Council. He clearly points out what is the true original source of infallibility in the Church, that is to say, Christ Himself, Who is the principal Rock; and he remarks that Christ communicated to Peter the same solidity of faith when He appointed him rock of the Church. In bestowing this prerogative on His Disciple, the Divine Founder of the Church at the same time willed that it should be a permanent gift, everlasting as the Rock on which the Church was built; and, to carry out His gracious economy, He ordained that Peter should be ever living in his Successors, ever teaching through their lips, ever bearing witness to the unchanging faith: to do which is the brightest ornament of his Primacy. It is thus that he is led to repeat the assertion already made by his

[153] S. Leo, *Epist.* xciii. *ad Synod Chalced.*, cap. ii. (Op., t. i., p. 1071. Edit. Ball.).

[154] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* cxx. *ad Theodoretum Episc.*, cap. i. (l. c., p. 1219).

predecessor, and which in later times was the true boast of Hormisdas and of Agatho, that the Roman See has never been stained with error and heresy; and thus, too, he was able to declare to the Fathers of Chalcedon that his exposition of faith was quite sufficient as a guide to the belief which they were to hold, and that no further discussion was needed upon the matter. Now, suppose that the claim of infallibility here put forward by Pope Leo were contrary to or even beyond what the constitution of the Church allowed, is it credible that the Bishops and people would have suffered so public and emphatic a claim to pass unchallenged? To suppose this is to attribute to them a strange indifference upon a vital point.

The doctrine of Pope Leo I. was not forgotten by his successors. Simplicius (468—483), in his Letter to the Emperor Zeno, makes the same claim of infallibility, and ascribes it to the same source. "This and the same rule of Apostolic doctrine is always permanent in the successors of him whom the Lord intrusted with the care of all the flock, to whom He promised that He would be for ever with him, till the end of the world, against whom He said the gates of hell shall never prevail, and whose judgment would hinder that to be loosed in Heaven which he had bound upon the earth."[155] Simplicius had recourse to the promises made by Christ to Peter, as a certain pledge of the prerogatives of the Apostolical See, and, what is most to our purpose, found in them an assurance that this See would ever preserve in purity the very doctrine which Peter received from Christ and the Holy Ghost, and which could not be kept free from any spot or wrinkle unless the prerogative of infallibility were permanent in the See itself.

[155] S. Simplicius, *Epist.* iv. *ad Zenonem*, vel *Basiliscum* juxta Pagium (Labbe, t. v., p. 98).

The Popes never ceased at any time to inculcate upon the Faithful, as a fundamental maxim of the Catholic Church, that the Roman See is the very fountain of Christian truth, the very source of life, which therefore cannot grow turbid with error, or dry up, without the whole body of the Church being defiled or struck with death. The great Pope Gelasius (492—496), who maintained so strenuous a fight on behalf of the supreme authority of the Apostolical See against the tyrannical persecutions of the Emperor Anastasius, expressed these unalterable principles in his Letters addressed to that Prince and to the Oriental Clergy. In his Epistle to the Emperor, after having laid down that the faith must be one in the whole Church, and perfectly pure and immaculate, he continues: "This it is against which the Apostolic See so anxiously guards—that the faith be not defiled—that as the glorious confession of the Apostle is the root of all the world, it may not be deformed by any rent of perversity or by any contagion. For if (which God avert, and which, as we trust, cannot come to pass) any such thing should happen, how should we dare to oppose error, or what would be our hope for the correction of the wanderers?"[156] Gelasius not only professes the infallibility of his See, but he also points out the absolute necessity of this infallibility in the sense above explained. The same doctrine is again insisted on by the great Pontiff in his Letters addressed to all the Oriental Bishops; but in an especial manner in his

[156] S. Gelasius, *Epist.* viii. *ad Anastasium Imp.* (Labbe, t. v., p. 309). "Hoc est quod Sedes Apostolica magnopere cavet, ut quia mundo radix est Apostoli gloriosa confessio, nulla rima pravitatis, nulla prorsus contagione maculetur. Nam si (quod Deus avertat, quod fieri non posse confidimus) tale aliquid proveniret, unde cuiquam resistere auderemus errori, vel unde correctionem errantibus posceremus?"

Tractatus, written on occasion of the controversy with Acacius, and forwarded to the Eastern Church. "There, in Rome," he says, "as Peter shone conspicuous for power of doctrine, so also, after his glorious blood-shedding, does he repose in a place of everlasting rest, granting to the See which he himself blessed, the privilege that, according to the Lord's promise, it be never overcome by the gates of hell; that it be the safe harbour for all who are tempest-tossed. Let all such as despise this See consider what excuse they will be able to plead at the day of Judgment."[157] All the Popes concur in proclaiming these same principles, which form the key-stone of the whole economy of the Catholic Church. Gelasius, closely agreeing with his predecessors, declares that the Roman See is that rock, that pillar of truth, which shall never be shaken by the powers of darkness; that it is the safe harbour, where all those who are tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, may find calm and peace; and he declares that this prerogative is due to Rome, as having been the See of the Apostle Peter, and blessed with his glorious martyrdom; maintaining that this is the fruit of divine promises. Now what is implied in saying that the See of Rome is the safe harbour of peace for minds tossed about by the storm of error? Unquestionably that it is the source of truth; because it is divinely founded in truth, and shall never be separated from it—that is to say, because it has for its prerogative infallibility in faith. In the famous Decree concerning Apocryphal writings, Gelasius implies the same view of the Apostolic See. "The

[157] *Epist.* xiv., vel *Tractatus Gelasii Papæ* (Labbe, t. v., p. 342). "Præstans Sedi (Petrus) quam ipse benedixit, ut a portis inferi nunquam pro Domini promissione vincatur, omniumque sit fluctuantium tutissimus portus. In quo qui requieverit beata et æterna statione gaudebit," &c.

Roman Church," he says, "is the principal See of the Apostle St. Peter, and it has no spot, no wrinkle, nor any such thing."[158] That is to say, the Roman Church alone has the same prerogative as is stated by St. Paul to belong to the Universal Church, and this prerogative cannot possibly exist in separation from the divine gift of infallibility.

This doctrine of Papal Infallibility, which was so constantly professed and constantly proclaimed by the Popes of the fourth and fifth centuries, was in the beginning of the sixth embodied by Pope Hormisdas (514—523) in a dogmatic formulary of faith, sent by him to the Oriental Church, and which was adopted, formally receiving the signatures of the Bishops both of East and West alike. The formulary is as follows:—"The first step to salvation is to keep the rule of faith, and by no means to deviate from the Constitutions of the Fathers, because we may by no means disregard the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who said—'Thou art Peter,' &c. These things which were said are proved by their effects, for in the Apostolic See the faith has always been preserved without spot. Therefore, wishing never to be separated from this See in hope and faith, and following in all things the Constitutions of the Fathers, we anathematise all the heretics, &c. Wherefore, as we said above, following in everything the Apostolic See, and making all its decisions our own, we hope to be worthy to be with you in that one communion which the Apostolic See supports, and in which the whole and true solidity of Christian faith is found. And we promise also not to mention during the Sacred Mysteries the names of those who are deprived of the communion of the Catholic Church, that is to say, of those who do not agree with the Apostolic

[158] *Decretum Gelasii de Apocryphis Scripturis*, in Conc. Romano i., an. 494 (Labbe, t. v., p. 386).

See."[159] In this formulary of faith the Infallibility of the Roman See is stated with a clearness beyond risk of mistake. Hormisdas asserts that the Catholic faith has always been preserved in the Roman See with the utmost purity. Nor is his assertion to be held as a mere historical statement; it is rigorously dogmatic, for the fact of the faith being kept so pure and undefiled in the Roman See is alleged by the Pope as a confirmation and an explanation of the promise conveyed in the words of Christ—"Thou art Peter," &c. Therefore the fact of the ever-immaculate faith of the Apostolic See is the object of the divine promise, and consequently this fact implies a dogma. It is on this account that the strict obligation is imposed to follow in everything the Apostolic See, and entirely to submit to its decisions as a condition of enjoying that one communion which the religion of Christ essentially requires. To reject in any degree the faith of the Apostolic See is nothing else than to reject the Divine Word, of which this See is the infallible organ. The meaning, then, of the formulary is clear, and it is equally clear that it received the adhesion of the Church. The form was signed, not only by all the

[159] See it in Labbe, t. v., p. 582, or in Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, n. xx., p. 49. Edit. cit. "Prima salus est regulam rectæ fidei custodire et a constitutis Patrum nullatenus deviare: quia non potest Domini nostri J. C. prætermitti sententia dicentis: 'Tu es Petrus,' etc. Hæc quæ dicta sunt rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper servata religio. Ab hac ergo spe et fide separari minime cupientes et Patrum sequentes in omnibus constituta, anathematizamus omnes hæreticos, etc. Unde sicut prædiximus, sequentes in omnibus Apostolicam Sedem et prædicantes ejus omnia constituta, spero, ut in una communione vobiscum, quam Sedes Apostolica prædicat, esse merear, in qua est integra et verax Christianæ religionis soliditas. Promittens etiam sequestratos a communione Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, idest non consentientes Sedi Apostolicæ, eorum nomina inter sacra non esse recitanda mysteria."

Bishops of the East, including the Patriarchs of Constantinople, John, Epiphanius, and Mennas, and by the Emperor Justinian more than once;[160] but also by all the Western and again by the Eastern Bishops assembled in the Eighth Ecumenical Council.[161] The author of the *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani* does not hesitate to assert that the formulary of Hormisdas became the formulary of faith for all the Church, and the truth of his assertion is supported by the repeated testimony of the Bishops of the West, of France especially, frequently given from the sixth century downwards. Hence the same writer concludes that no Christian can possibly reject such a formulary, which has been spread everywhere and in every age, and sanctioned by an Ecumenical Council.[162] It follows, then, that the assertion of Papal Infallibility has been made and practically adopted by the whole Church, and this implies that the doctrine has come down from the Apostles.

The Letters of Hormisdas are in perfect harmony with the formula which we have been considering, and were it necessary we could adduce many passages to this effect. Nor this only when addressing a Latin Bishop, as Avitus,[163] but even when dealing with Oriental Prelates, and with the Patriarchs themselves. Thus he orders his Legates to declare to the Bishop

[160] *Exemplar Precum Justiniani Imp. ad Hormisdam* (Labbe, t. v., p. 829); *Id., Ad Agapitum Papam* (*Ibid.*, p. 938); *Id., Ad eundem* (*Ibid.*, p. 947); *Sententia Mennæ* (l. c., p. 1058).

[161] Conc. Const. iv., Act. i. (Labbe, t. x., p. 479).

[162] *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xv., cap. vii., t. ii., p. 337, seq. Edit. Basileæ. "Hæc ergo ubique diffusa, omnibus sæculis propagata, ab Œcumenico Concilio consecrata quis respuat Christianus?" (p. 338).

[163] *Epist.* x. *Hormisdæ ad Avitum* (Labbe, t. v., p. 586). "Novimus Eutychetem atque Nestorium Apostolicæ, idest Catholicæ sententiæ auctoritate damnatos," etc.

of Thessalonica that he ought to receive doctrine at the hands of the Apostolic See, and learn from the Pope at Rome the explanation of his difficulties and doubts, and that by acting in this manner he would show himself truly a Catholic.[164] To the Patriarch of Constantinople he writes, at the same time, that he ought without hesitation to follow the judgments and decisions of the Apostolic See, whose faith he was professing to embrace.[165] Of course he was to act thus in order to prove his orthodoxy, for in the persuasion of Hormisdas, as of all his predecessors, communion with the Apostolic See, or condemnation by it, are equivalent to communion with the Catholic Church, or excommunication.[166] But it is most important to remark that Hormisdas, like the other Popes, in asserting Papal Infallibility, did not merely express an opinion of his own, but the persuasion of the whole Church. In the case of Hormisdas this is especially plain, for his formulary of faith declared the Infallibility of the Apostolic See in the strongest terms, and still it was received and signed by the Universal Church without the least contradiction, remark, or hesitation. This evidently shows that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility proclaimed and enforced by Hormisdas, was already deeply rooted, and had entered into the very life of the Church. History furnishes us also with another proof, in a letter of the Emperor Justinian to the same Pontiff. At the date of this

[164] *Epist.* lxii. *ad Legatos* (Labbe, l. c., p. 642). "Peragite ut Thessalonicensis Episcopus, . . . a principe ad urbem directus, ab Apostolica percipiat Sede doctrinam, et quidquid sibi dubium putet, huc veniens præsenti a nobis inquisitione condiscat; sic enim probare potest se Catholicæ professionis servare cautelam."

[165] *Epist.* xxix. *ad Joannem Constant. Epis.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 609). "Quid restat mihi ut Sedis Apostolicæ, cujus fidem te dicis amplecti, sequaris etiam sine trepidatione judicia."

[166] See Epist. cit., *Ad Avitum; Epist.* xviii. *ad Ennodium et Peregrinum* (Labbe, l. c., p. 594); etc.

letter Justinian was not yet, it is true, at the head of the Empire, but while nominally subject to the Emperor Justin I., he had in fact in his hands the administration of the State. At this time the Monophysites were again rising into notice, the Act of Union with the Roman Church signed by the Oriental Bishops in 519 having failed to crush them; and, as before, they had resort to the addition made to the Trisagion—*One of the Trinity was crucified,* as a party formula well suited to arouse fresh troubles and renew the disorders of the schism. The leadership of the movement had at this time fallen into the hands of certain Scythian Monks. Justinian determined to check the movement at once, but for this purpose he did not look for help to any of the Patriarchs or Prelates of the East, nor to their Synods; his application was addressed to the Roman Pontiff. A special ambassador was sent to seek for light at Rome, and the Emperor supplicated the Pope to pronounce a decision which would give *certainty* to the Church. "Because," he continues, "we believe that to be Catholic which is imposed by your religious judgment;"[167] and he is confident that the doctrine pronounced by the Pope is the means to restore unity in the whole world.[168] In this letter, then, Justinian shows clearly how wide-spread was the belief in Papal Infallibility. The Pope is for him not only the Supreme Doctor in the Church, but also the one from whose

[167] *Exemplum Epistolæ Justiniani ad Hormisdam* (Labbe, l. c., p. 650). "Quod si suscipiendum sit paterna provisione reverentia vestra, cautissimo suo rescripto, quid sequi, quidve super hoc evitare debeamus, nos certiorare dignetur. . . . Imponite igitur vobis semel susceptum laborem, sancte et venerabilis Pater . . . et de hac intentione liberos nos properate reddere et securos. Hoc enim credimus esse Catholicum quod vestro religioso responso nobis fuerit intimatum."

[168] "Summo cum desiderio fidem Catholicam amplectentes, vestra doctrina unitatem universo orbi petimus condonare" (l. c.).

mouth the faith is to be learned, and who can give certainty in the midst of controversy. The Emperor also, speaking in the name of the whole East, professes his belief that the decisions of the Pope ought to be held as Catholic tenets, and that the unity of the Church rests upon the doctrine of the Pope. We here have an expression of the fundamental idea of Papal Infallibility.

The successors of Hormisdas followed in the steps of their predecessors in the Apostolic Chair. Thus Pope Vigilius (538—553), agreeing with Innocent I., insisted that all the causes of faith should be brought before his Apostolical tribunal, that they might be terminated by his judgment.[169] We have seen upon what principle Innocent I. rested this Decree, and Vigilius expresses the same view; for a cause of faith cannot be said to be terminated for the Universal Church except by an infallible authority acknowledged by the whole Church. Pope Pelagius II. (578—590), as we mentioned elsewhere, anathematised all who should refuse to submit to the faith defined at Chalcedon and taught by Leo I.; but, he remarks, the duty of firmly adhering to this faith arises from its being founded on the solidity of Peter, whom Christ intrusted with the office of confirming his brethren.[170] Nor does he betray any belief that this prerogative belonged personally and exclusively to Peter, since he rests on it his own right of confirming his brethren and bringing them to the

[169] *Epist.* vii. *Vigilii Papæ* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1300). See also *Epist.* ix. (l. c., p. 1302). "Apostolicæ Sedi terminanda (certamina de religione) servate."

[170] *Epist.* v. *Pelagii II.*, quæ est i. ad Eliam et Episcopos Istriæ (Labbe, t. vi., p. 626). "Considerate carissimi quia veritas mentiri non potest, nec fides Petri in æternum quassari poterit vel mutari: nam cum omnes discipulos diabolus ad excribrandum poposcit, pro solo Petro se Dominus rogasse testatur, et ab eo voluit ceteros confirmari."

right belief.[171] Hence we see that he attributes to the Pontifical authority enjoyed by him that prerogative of infallibility, which was granted to the Head of the Apostles by the words of our Lord. Gregory I., his successor (590—604), notwithstanding his great humility and reserve, did not abstain from holding up to view the same essential prerogative of his Papal Supremacy. In fact he, like his predecessors, ordered that all causes of faith should be reserved for his supreme judgment;[172] and in a Letter to the Bishops of Gaul he clearly states the reason for the reservation; he says that causes of this nature could be terminated only by his due and certain definition.[173] On this account he does not make any difference between ecclesiastical tradition and his own profession of faith, nor again between this and the confession of St. Peter; therefore he concludes that all who hold his faith hold the confession of the Prince of the Apostles, and rest on the rock of the Church.[174] In conformity with this doctrine he calls the Apostolic See the head of faith:[175] the head is the guide and the regulating power in the human body. If then the Apostolic See is the head of faith, it must be the guiding and regulating power of faith, and consequently

[171] "Nos secundum evangelicam vocem studemus fraternitati et dilectioni vestræ . . . quæ nobis jussa sunt, cum sinceritate cordis exhibere. Nostis enim in evangelio dominum proclamantem: 'Simon, Simon,' etc."—Luke xxii.—(l. c.).

[172] *Epist.*, l. v., *Epist.* liii. *ad Vigilium Episc.* (Op., t. ii., p. 783. Edit. Bened.); et *Epist.* liv. (l. c., p. 784).

[173] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* liv. (l. c.). "Quatenus a nobis valeat sine dubio sententia terminari."

[174] "Cum itaque integritatem nostram ex aperta mea traditione seu professione cognoscitis, dignum est ut de Ecclesia S. Petri Apostolorum Principis nullum ulterius scrupulum dubietatis habeatis: sed in vera fide persistite, et vitam vestram in petra Ecclesiæ, hoc est in confessione beati Petri Apostolorum Principis solidata" (*Epist.*, l. iv., ep. xxxviii., l. c., p. 718).

[175] *Epist.*, l. xiii., ep. xxxvii., l. c., p. 1244.

infallible; for there cannot be any power upon earth divinely appointed to guide and regulate divine faith without being infallible in its utterances of faith. In another section we shall have to speak at length of Pope Agatho (678—682) and of the Sixth Ecumenical Council; it will therefore be sufficient here to point out one or two passages of the Pope's Letter to the Emperor, read in that Synod, in which he solemnly asserted Papal Infallibility. He explicitly declares that the Roman See had never at any time declined from the straight path of truth, but had always been preserved from error since the Apostles placed in it the deposit of revealed doctrine; and that it would always so last till the end of time, pure and immaculate in its teaching. He alleges in proof of this the promise made by our Lord to Peter, that his faith should never fail.[176] The same language is held by his successor, Leo II. (682——683). This Pope, in his Letter to the Emperor after the Sixth Synod, declares in what sense and for what reason he sanctions the doctrine of faith fixed by the Council. "Since," he says, "the holy universal and great Sixth Synod has followed in everything the Apostolic doctrine of the most eminent Fathers, and since it preached the same definition of the right of faith, which the Apostolic See of the holy Apostle

[176] "Quæ (Ecclesia Romana) ejus (Petri) annitente præsidio nunquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est" (*Epist. Agathonis Papæ ad Constant. Imp.*, in Act. iv. Conc. Const. iii. Labbe, t. vii., p. 659). "Quæ (Eccl. Rom.) per Dei Omnipotentis gratiam a tramite Apostolicæ traditionis nunquam errasse probabitur, nec hæreticis novitatibus depravata succubuit, sed ut ab exordio fidei Christianæ percepit ab auctoribus suis Apostolorum Christi principibus illibata fine tenus permanet, secundum ipsius Domini Salvatoris divinam pollicitationem, quam suorum Discipulorum Principi in sacris Evangelicis fatus est: 'Petre, Petre, inquiens,' etc."—Luc. xxii. 31, 32—(*Ibid.* Labbe, l. c. p. 662). See our pamphlet, *Pope Honorius*, p. 88.

Peter received with veneration, therefore we, and through our exercise of our office this venerable Apostolic See, give full consent to the things contained in the definition of faith," &c.[177] The main reason therefore, as we remarked in another work,[178] why Pope Leo sanctions the definition of the right faith is, because he found it conformable with the doctrine of the Pontifical See, by which the Synod itself, according to its own confession, had been instructed. This was nothing short of exhibiting the Pontifical See as the authentic organ of the Apostolic teaching. It was not enough that the doctrine contained in the definition agreed with the doctrine of the Fathers; it was necessary that it should also be in agreement with the teaching of the Apostolic See; for the doctrine of the Fathers is a stream from that head fountain. But if the truth of a dogmatic doctrine depends upon its agreeing with the teaching of the Pontifical See, we have here a plain evidence of the infallibility of that See in its doctrinal *magisterium.* We conclude then that Pope Leo II., no less than his predecessors, upheld the doctrine of Pontifical Infallibility.

The Popes of the seventh century, whom we have mentioned, spoke the language of the whole Church in favour of Infallibility. In that very age St. Maximus of Constantinople, one of the most learned Doctors and Martyrs of his time, bore witness to this doctrine in the plainest terms. He makes no difference between the Roman See and the Catholic Church, asserting that whoever is recognised by the Roman See, is everywhere and by every one looked upon as pious and orthodox. Nor does he distinguish between the Roman Pontiff

[177] *Exemplum Relationis Leonis II. ad Constantinum Imp.* (Labbe, t. vii., p. 1153).

[178] See *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, n. iv., p. 110, seq.

and the Roman See, but he identifies the two; so that the Pope is personally regarded as the source of Catholic doctrine and the centre of orthodox faith.[179] A Doctor who speaks in these terms of the Roman See, evidently teaches its infallibility. And it must be remarked that the holy Doctor enforces these principles when speaking of Pyrrhus, the Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople. And it is well known that when this heretical Patriarch yielded to the arguments of St. Maximus and embraced the Catholic faith, he acted on the principles inculcated by the holy Doctor, and going to Rome, presented to Pope Theodore a *Libellus* of faith, in which he fully condemned his past errors.[180] About the same time, Sergius of Cyprus addressed a letter to the same Pope Theodore, which was read in the Lateran Council, proclaiming this singular prerogative of the Holy See. "Christ our Lord," he says, "O sacred Head, has constituted your Apostolic See, as the foundation divinely firm and immoveable, as the brightest monument of the faith. For thou art Peter, as the divine word has truly proclaimed thee, and upon that rock the columns of the Church are built."[181] Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, spoke the same language in the same age. When intrusting Stephen of Dora with the commission of going to Rome in

[179] *Epist. S. Maximi ad Petrum illustrem* (Op., t. ii., p. 144. Edit. Migne). "Omnis qui eos, qui Pyrrhum reprobaverunt, anathematizat, Sedem Romanam, idest Catholicam Ecclesiam anathematizat. . . . Festinet pro omnibus Sedi Romanæ satisfacere. Hac enim satisfacta communiter ubique omnes pium hunc et orthodoxum prædicabunt. Nam frustra solummodo loquitur, qui mihi similes suadendos ac suscipiendos putat, et non satisfacit et implorat sanctissimæ Romanorum Ecclesiæ beatissimum Papam, idest Apostolicam Sedem," etc.

[180] Conc. Lat. sub Martino I. Papa, Secr. i. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 91).

[181] *Epist. Sergii Cypriensis Episc. ad Theodorum Papam*, in Conc. Lat. i., Secr. ii. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 125, seq.).

order to secure a final condemnation of Monothelism, he entreated him to repair as soon as possible to Rome, where the foundations of the orthodox faith are laid.[182] Language such as this certainly reflects the universal persuasion of the Infallibility of the Pope; especially seeing that these holy Prelates addressed the Apostolic See for the purpose of getting a final sentence against error and heresy. They say, without any fear of exaggeration, not only that the Pope is Peter, but that the pillars of the Catholic Church, and the foundations of the orthodox dogmas, rest on him. How could this be said without error if the Pope and his See be liable to error and heresy? In that case it would be untrue that the pillars and foundations of orthodoxy are grounded on a solid rock, not to be moved by all the powers of darkness. We have confined ourselves to the testimony of writers in the Eastern Church, our object being to prove how in that age the persuasion of Papal Infallibility was deeply rooted in the East.

There is no need to lengthen this section by multiplying quotations. But we cannot pass over the great Pope Nicholas I., who solemnly inculcated the doctrine of Infallibility in the Eastern Church at the time when the impious Photius was striving to detach it from the centre of unity. Not only does he remind Photius of the supreme power of Papal authority in the Church above the Ecumenical Councils themselves, which owe their strength to the authority of the Pope;[183] but also he recalls to his mind that all the Faithful seek for true doctrine, and derive integrity of faith from the holy Roman See, which is the Head of all the

[182] *Libellus Stephani Dorensis Episc.*, in Con. Lat. i., Secr. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 108, seq.).

[183] *Epist.* vi. *Nicolai Papæ ad Photium* (Labbe, t. ix., p. 1306).

Churches.[184] Therefore he asserts in another of his Letters to the Emperor Michael, that Methodius repaired to St. Peter and to him in order to be fed with the milk of the holy Roman Church, the Mother of all; and that he had learned from this Church how to defend the Catholic dogma; from it he had received the authority of preaching the true doctrine, and drawn from it strength to defeat and conquer the Iconoclasts.[185] For the same reason he lays down the great principle that no one can call again into question that which the Apostolic See has decided, and that no one can ever judge its judgments.[186] Nor did he speak in this manner as giving merely his own personal opinion; he expressed the persuasion of the Universal Church, and especially of the East. There are several letters of St. Theodorus Studita, who lived in the ninth century, which are sufficient to show how the doctrine of Papal Infallibility had, at that time, struck deep root among the Easterns. It is impossible to find stronger language than he employs. A few extracts of his letters are given in the notes, to justify our assertion.[187] But we have at hand another

[184] *Epist.* vi., p. 1303. "Universitas credentium ab hac sancta Romana Ecclesia, quæ caput est Ecclesiarum, doctrinam exquirit, integritatem fidei deposcit."

[185] *Epist.* viii. *Nicolai Papæ ad Michaelem* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1332).

[186] *Ibid.*, p. 1339.

[187] Theodorus Studita, *Epist.*, l. ii., *Epist* xii. *ad Pasqualem I.* (Migne, t. xcix., *PP. GG.*, p. 1151). "Audi Apostolicum caput, a Deo præposite pastor ovium Christi, janitor regni cœlorum, petra fidei super quam ædificata est Catholica Ecclesia. Petrus enim tu, Petri sedem exornans et gubernans" (*Epist.* xiii., ejusdem libri, *Ad Pasqualem I.*, l. c., p. 1154). "Respexit nos Oriens ex alto, Christus Deus noster tuam in Occidente beatitudinem, tanquam facem quamdam divinitus lucentem, ad Ecclesiæ quæ sub cœlo est illuminationem in Apostolica prima Sede constituens" (l. c., p. 1155). "Vos igitur illimis revera et sincerus ab initio fons orthodoxæ veritatis: vos adversus omnem hæreticam procellam tranquillus sepositus Ecclesiæ universæ portus: vos a Deo electa

argument from the formulary of faith written by Pope Nicholas himself, and sent to Constantinople to receive the adhesion of the Bishops. This formulary of faith embodies that of Pope Hormisdas, which affords so clear a testimony to Papal Infallibility. Although the schismatical party of Photius refused submission to that formulary when Pope Hadrian II., successor of Nicholas I., sent it again to Constantinople as a condition of peace, all the Clergy, as Anastasius the Librarian informs us, copied and signed it, so that no one was admitted into the Eighth Ecumenical Council who had not presented that profession of faith signed with his own hand.[188] We must then again conclude that Nicholas I., when proclaiming his own infallibility, reflected the persuasion of the Universal Church, and that he was the authentic organ of the Catholic intellect. We have no need to quote testimonies from other Popes from Nicholas I. down to Leo IX., who reigned at the time of Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to whom is due the final separation of the Oriental from the Latin Church. But we cannot pass over the words addressed by the last-named Pope to the schismatical Patriarch, in which the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Papal See is undoubtedly inculcated. He refers to the words of Christ as intended for all the Successors of St. Peter—"I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not;" and he continues, "Can there be any one so foolish as to believe that the prayer of Him Who can do what He wills will fail in any one of Peter's Successors? Have not the novelties of heretics in all times been overthrown by the See of the Prince of the

civitas refugii salutis," &c. Many other extracts could be produced from the *Epist.* lxiii., l. ii. (l. c., p. 1282); *Epist.* lxxxvi., l. ii. (l. c., p. 1331); *Epist.* cxxix., l. ii. (l. c., p. 1419), &c.

[188] Anastasius Bibl., *Notæ ad Conc. Œc.* viii. (Labbe, t. x., p. 498, seq.).

Apostles—that is to say, by the Roman Church, through Peter himself as well as through his Successors? Have not the hearts of the brethren been confirmed in the faith of St. Peter, which till now has not failed, and never shall fail till the end?"[189] The words of this great Pontiff need no comment whatever. But they remind us that the Popes were in the habit of applying to their See and to themselves the above words and promise of our Lord, as Gelasius,[190] Pelagius,[191] Vitalian,[192] Hadrian I.,[193] and others; and also of drawing from the text their own infallibility, as was done by Agatho,[194] and Leo IX. himself,[195] as well as by their successors, Pascal II.,[196] Innocent III.,[197] and others. Likewise they grounded the prerogatives of indefectibility and infallibility of the Apostolic See on the words recorded by St. Matthew xvi. 18, as Leo I.,[198] Simplicius,[199] Gelasius,[200] &c. These practices prove evidently that long before the time of Gregory VII., and much more before the Council of Constance, St. Thomas, or the theologians of the sixteenth century, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility had been authentically

[189] *Epist.* i. *Leonis IX. ad Michaelem Const. Patr.*, n. vii. (Labbe, t. ix., p. 1323).

[190] *Epist.* xiv. *Gelasii Papæ* (Labbe, t. v., p. 341).

[191] *Epist.* v. *Pelagii II. ad Eliam* (Labbe, t. vi., p. 426).

[192] *Epist.* i. *ad Paulum Episc. Cret.* (Labbe, t. vii., p. 460).

[193] *Epist. ad Carolum Regem pro Synodo Nicæna* (Labbe, t. viii., p. 1553).

[194] *Epist. Agathonis Papæ ad Const. Imperat.*, in Conc. Œc. vi., Act. iv. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 662).

[195] L. c.

[196] In Conc. Lateranensi iv. sub Paschali II. (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1227).

[197] *Epist.* ccix. *Innocentii III. ad Patriarcham Const. Reg.*, l. ii., p. 759. Edit. Migne.

[198] S. Leo Papa, *Serm.* iii., capp. ii., iii. (Op., t. i., p. 12. Edit. Ball.).

[199] *Epist.* iv. *Simplicii Papæ* (Labbe, t. v.; p. 98).

proclaimed by the Supreme Pastors of the Church. So that the Pontiffs who in more recent times have solemnly condemned propositions contrary to that doctrine, have done no more than echo the teaching of a long line among their predecessors.

SECTION V.

THE APOSTOLIC SEE A SUPREME AND INFALLIBLE TRIBUNAL OF FAITH.

IT has seemed to members of the School of theological opinion which goes by the name of Anglican, that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is opposed to the principles according to which the Church declares any matter to be of faith. The High Church party agree in this view, and it is sufficient to mention the Rev. W. Palmer, author of the *Treatise on the Church of Christ*,[201] and Dr. Pusey, who is fairly considered as the leader and principal organ of that party.[202] The last-named speaks expressly upon the matter:[203] "The personal Infallibility of the Pope, by himself, is a great change both in the constitution of the Church and the principles upon which it declares any matter to be *de fide*." According to this School, "no fixed rule exists in the Church as to settling disputes of faith."[204] Heresies, they think, may be condemned by the whole Church without a general Council, there being other ways of ascertaining the mind of the Church.[205] They deny the infallibility even

[200] *Epist.* xiv., sive *Tract. de Resp. ad Græcos* (Labbe, t. v., p. 341).

[201] Vol. ii., pt. iv., ch. vii., sects. i., ii., p. 114, seq. Edit. of 1842.

[202] *Eirenicon*, p. 124. Edit. 1865.

[203] *Ibid.*

[204] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

[205] *Ibid.*, pp. 88—90.

of General Councils confirmed by the Pope,[206] which doctrine was admitted even by the Gallicans as *de fide;* and was rejected only by the followers of Richer and Febronius, and by a part of the sect of Jansenists. The High Church party seem to have no clear views upon the subject, and they venture to assert that it is a matter of opinion among Roman Catholics.[207] They seem to believe that the principles according to which the Church declares any matter to be of faith, are that the doctrine should be proposed as such by the full consent of the whole Church; again, that this consent be made manifest either by a General Council or by other ways to which their writers allude, but which they do not explain. Let us examine whether these were the principles according to which, in the early ages, doctrines were declared *de fide,* and errors were condemned as heresies. We have already shown, especially in our third section, that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, far from being a change in the constitution of the Church, is identified with it. In the present section this truth will appear yet more clearly when the real principles are stated according to which in antiquity doctrines were proposed as matters of faith.

We have already mentioned in the preceding section that the *Causæ Majores,* concerning faith and the state of the Church, were considered as belonging exclusively to the Apostolical See. In developing the truth of this, we said enough to show that the Papal right in judging definitively in matters of faith was of divine origin. A passage taken from a Letter of Pope Julius I., quoted by St. Athanasius in his *Apologia,*[208] not only

[206] See Palmer, Op. cit., l. c.

[207] *Ibid.*, l. c.

[208] *Epist. Julii Papæ ad Eusebianos,* n. 22 (Coustant, p. 386, seq.); in S. Athanasii *Apologia contra Arianos,* n. 35 (Op., t. i., p. 121. Edit. Patavii, 1775).

will confirm this doctrine, but will also show clearly what was the constant practice in the Church with regard to the condemnation of new heresies. "Are you ignorant," says the Pontiff, addressing the Eusebian Bishops of the Eastern Church, "that this has been the custom of the Church—that, first of all, letters should be sent to us, that thus what is just may be decreed from this place? If therefore any suspicion fall upon a Bishop, it would be right to apply to this Church. But now, they who informed us not, but left us ignorant of the course of events, make themselves supporters of the suspicious views. Such were not the ordinances of St. Paul, nor was it so handed us down by the Fathers; this is a form altogether strange, and a new institution." This passage from the Letter of Pope Julius is sufficient to prove that, according to the guiding principles of the Church, no decree whatever of faith can be enacted without the final and definitive sentence of the Pope. Socrates, the Greek historian, speaking of this Letter, remarks that "by the law of the Church it is forbidden to decree anything over and above the judgment of the Roman Pontiff."[209] Sozomen, another Greek historian, uses similar language concerning this same Letter of Pope Julius.[210] "It is a law of the Church," he says, "by which anything whatever declared over and above the judgment of the Roman Pontiff should be held as altogether null and void." To these authorities we could also add that of the *Tripartite History*, in which the same remark is insisted upon.[211] Innocent I., in his Letter to the Fathers

[209] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. ii., cap. xvii., p. 94, seq. Edit. Valesii. *τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ κανόνος κελεύοντος, μὴ δεῖν παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης κανονίζειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας.*

[210] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. iii., cap. x., p. 510. Edit. Valesii.

[211] Cassiodorus, *Hist. Tripart.*, l. iv., cap. ix. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxix., p. 960).

assembled at Milevis, which we quoted above, points out in the most absolute manner the universal law of the Church with regard to controversies of faith: they must all be referred to the Chair of St. Peter.[212] Gelasius enforced the same law of the Universal Church in his Letter to the Bishops of Dardania and Illyricum;[213] and in another of his Letters he complains in strong terms that there were some who thought to set up certain Canons as opposed to the Pontifical right of receiving appeals from the whole Church, while in truth these very Canons prescribed that appeals from the whole Church should be brought before the Pontifical See; that this See had jurisdiction over the whole Church, while its judgments were subject to no appeal, nor was the See itself subject to any jurisdiction whatever.[214]

The claim put forward by Pope Gelasius reflects the practice of the Universal Church and the divine prerogative, which in the persuasion of all had always

[212] *Epist.* xxx. *Innoc. I. ad Patres Milev.*, cap. ii. (Coustant, p. 896). "Quoties fidei ratio ventilatur, arbitror omnes fratres et coëpiscopos nostros nonnisi ad Petrum, idest sui nominis et honoris auctorem referre debere."

[213] *Epist.* xviii., n. 4 (Thiel, *Epist. RR. PP.*, t. i., p. 385. Brunsbergæ, 1868). "Si quos vero novos didiceritis motus exurgere, nobis fraterna debetis consuetudine reserare, quo subinde quæ Patrum regulis congruant, præstante Domino remedia procuremus."

[214] *Epist.* x., seu *Commonitorium ad Faustum*, n. 5 (Thiel, *Epist. RR. PP.*, t. i., p. 343, seq.). "Nobis opponunt canones, dum nesciunt quid loquantur. Contra quos hoc ipso venire se produnt, quod Primæ Sedi, sana rectaque suadenti, parere fugiunt. Ipsi sunt canones, qui Appellationes totius Ecclesiæ ad hujus Sedis examen voluere deferri. Ab ipsa vero nusquam prorsus appellari debere sanxerunt. Ac pro hoc illam de tota Ecclesia judicare, ipsam ad nullius commeare judicium, nec de ejus unquam præceperunt judicio judicari. Sententiamque illius constituerunt non oportere dissolvi, cujus potius decreta sequenda mandarunt."

belonged to the Roman Church alone. It is unquestionable that from the remotest ages of Christianity the See of Rome was regarded as the supreme tribunal in matters of faith, to which all causes concerning faith ought to be referred, and by which the definitive sentence should be pronounced without any appeal whatever. The embassy sent by the Martyrs of Lyons to Pope Eleutherius shows in what light the Christians of the second century regarded the See of Rome. The controversy then concerned the errors spread by Montanus, Alcibiades, and Theodotus, who caused great commotion and dissension in Gaul. The holy Martyrs, while in prison, wrote letters to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia, condemning the errors of these men. But in order to restore peace and harmony in the Churches, they addressed their prayers to Pope Eleutherius,[215] and to him they despatched Irenæus, then a Priest, with their commendatory letters, as well as with those of the Clergy of Lyons, in order that he might negotiate with the Pontiff and settle the controversy, restoring peace to the Churches both of the West and of the East.[216] Thus the Martyrs sent a regular embassy to the Pope, with the certain persuasion that the authority of the Roman See could quench the fire of discord and re-establish peace and unity in faith. Protestant writers, and Dr. Routh among them, try their very utmost to wrest this argument from the hands of Catholics. It is true that the letters of the Martyrs were sent into Phrygia and Asia, where the errors and the impostures of Montanus and his companions had made great progress. The passage of Eusebius is clear enough in this respect; but that the embassy of the Martyrs was sent to those Churches no less than to

[215] Eusebius, *H. E.*, l. v., cap. iii., p. 168. Edit. Valesii.

[216] *Frag. Epist. Martyrum Lugdunensium*, in Coustant, *Epist Rom. PP.*, p. 87, seq.; in Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ.*, t. i., p. 287.

Eleutherius must be absolutely denied. Eusebius, and the fragments of the letter to which he refers, plainly testify that St. Irenæus was intrusted with a special mission to Pope Eleutherius, that he might, as it were, negotiate for the peace of the Churches.[217] The fact of their sending an especial embassy to Rome shows what was the idea they had, in the middle of the second century, of the supreme authority of the Pope to put down errors and heresies which defiled the purity of the faith. For, the doctrine propagated by Montanus, Alcibiades, and Theodotus, beyond all controversy concerned the faith.

The existence of this universal persuasion becomes still more evident in later times. In the middle of the third century Dionysius of Alexandria knew well that Decrees had been passed in large assemblies of Bishops condemning baptism conferred by heretics; but he was also aware that Pope Stephen refused to hold communion with those who rebaptised heretics; upholding, in this, the Roman tradition, although he did not pronounce any definitive condemnation of the opposite practice, nor inflict any anathema upon its authors.[218] Now in this state of things a case involving the question chanced to occur at Alexandria. But Dionysius did not dare to administer a second baptism against the judgment of Pope Stephen; he therefore addressed a letter to Xystus II., the successor of that Pope, begging him to give instructions that he might not be deceived, as in fact he would have been,

[217] Eusebius, *H. E.*, l. v., capp. iii., iv., p. 168. The word πρεσβεύοντες, which is translated by Valesius, Routh, &c., "per legatione fungentes," might be better rendered "per legationem mittentes."

[218] In Eusebius, *H. E.*, l. vii., cap. ix., p. 254. . . . γὰρ ὄντως, ἀδελφὲ, καὶ συμβουλῆς, καὶ γνώμης αἰτῶ παρὰ σοῦ, τοιούτου τινός μοι προσελθόντος πράγματος δεδιὼς μὴ ἄρα σφάλλωμαι.

had he formed his opinion upon the numerous prominent Synods held in that age. Let us remark that Dionysius was Patriarch of an Apostolic and illustrious Church, and second in dignity to the Western Patriarch alone. He had inherited the tradition of the Apostles, and yet he turns his eyes to Rome, to the Patriarch of the West, in order to be enlightened and saved from hallucination. The consentient voice of many Synods of Bishops is not esteemed by him capable of giving security against mistake and deceit; he awaits from the mouth of the Pope the final word which is to give certainty to his mind, and screen him from danger of illusion; he professes therefore that a word upon a doctrinal matter from the Pope is of efficacy to outweigh the authority of numerous influential Synods, and give such a character of truth that no place could be left for any doubt or anxiety whatever. Now he who speaks thus must beyond doubt have had an intimate persuasion that the See of St. Peter is the supreme infallible court in causes of faith.

Again, St. Cyril, a successor of Dionysius in the Patriarchal See of Alexandria, affords another clear proof of our point. When Nestorius attempted to attack the dogma of the Incarnation, and was spreading the poison of his heretical doctrine through all parts of the Eastern Church, the Alexandrine Patriarch applied to Pope Celestine to ask whether he and the other Catholic Bishops of the East should abstain from any communion with Nestorius, then Patriarch of Constantinople, and solemnly condemn his errors.[219] But St. Cyril was fully aware not only that the doctrine of Nestorius was unreasonable and absurd, but also that it was contrary to the faith laid down by the Apostles.[220]

[219] *Epist.* xi. *ad Cœlestinum Papam* (Op., t. x., p. 80, seq. Edit. Migne).

[220] L. c., n. 2.

Already by his Encyclical Letters he had cautioned the Catholics of Egypt and of Macedonia against the new heresy; he had warned Nestorius himself, and pointed out to him how alien were his doctrines from the Catholic dogmas.[221] Moreover, he recognised that to him, as a Bishop and Patriarch, the keeping of the faith had been committed.[222] Nevertheless, he applies to the Pope for two principal reasons: first, because this was the constant practice of the whole Christian antiquity, that the causes of faith should be referred to the Roman Pontiff,[223] therefore he sends to Celestine the homilies of Nestorius, and extracts containing his erroneous propositions, that he might form his own judgment concerning the new errors;[224] secondly, because the certainty of the doctrine of faith, so necessary for the defence of revealed dogma, cannot be obtained except from the Apostolic See. He therefore entreats the Pope to pronounce sentence, that he and all the Catholics of the East might know what course they ought to take.[225] Now no doubt can be entertained that St. Cyril regarded the See of Rome as the supreme court, in which the causes of faith must be definitively settled. In fact, not only does he send to the Pope all the documents necessary for an impartial judgment, but also he implores from him a final sentence. At the same time Nestorius, fearing the effects of the judgment of the Roman See, forwarded to Celestine a long apology for his opinions, in order,

221 L. c., nn. 3, 4, p. 81, seq.

222 L. c., n. 6, p. 84.

223 L. c., n. 1. *τὰ μακρὰ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἔθη πείθουσιν ἀνακοινοῦσθαι τῇ σῇ ὁσιότητι.*

224 L. c., nn. 2 et 9, pp. 80, 85; *Commonitorium S. Cyrilli, Ibid.*, p. 85, seq. See also *Epist.* xiii. *S. Cyrilli ad Joannem Episc. Antioch.*, l. c., p. 93.

225 *Διὸ δὴ καταξίωσον τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν, καὶ πότερόν ποτε χρὴ κοινωνεῖν αὐτῷ* (L. c., n. 7, p. 84).

if possible, to deceive and gain him over.[226] The Pope, in the Roman Synod, pronounced his sentence; he approved the Catholic doctrine of St. Cyril, condemned the errors of Nestorius, and threatened the Byzantine Patriarch with degradation and excommunication if, within ten days, he should not disclaim and condemn his errors.[227] St. Cyril, writing to the Patriarch of Antioch concerning this decision of the Roman See, boldly declares that "it is necessary to be obeyed by all those who cleave to the communion of all the West."[228] We have seen that to be separated from the Roman See was deemed equivalent to separation from the Church Universal, whence follows the necessity of submitting to the sentence of the supreme tribunal of faith. But no Catholic can be separated from the Church of Christ as the penalty of not embracing a doctrine which is liable to error. According to St. Cyril, then, the decision of the Roman tribunal ought to be held as infallible.

In the same century we find equally clear proof in the case of Theodoret. Nothing can be more explicit than his letter to Pope Leo.[229] He begins by stating that causes concerning faith are necessarily referred to the Apostolic See; and confirms his assertion by the fact of the Roman Church having always been singular in preaching the doctrine of truth, and in spreading all over the world the rays of the right faith,[230] since faith is the principal privilege of that See.[231] But what

[226] *Epist.* xiii. *S. Cyrilli ad Joan. Antioch*, l. c., p. 96, et *Epist. Nestorii ad Cœlestinum Papam* (Penes Coustant, p. 1075, seq.).

[227] L. c., et *Epist. Cœlestini Papæ*, xi., xii., xiii., etc. (Coustant, pp. 1101, 1107, 1113, seq.), et *Conc. Romanum* (Labbe, t. iii., p. 553).

[228] *Epist.* xiii. *ad Joan. Antioch.*, l. c.

[229] *Epist.* cxiii. (Op., t. iv., p. 1312, seq. Edit. Migne).

[230] L. c., p. 1313.

[231] L. c.

was the purpose of this encomium of the Papal See? He lays the cause of his faith before Pope Leo, that he might judge whether it was in accord with the Apostolic doctrine, and pronounce a final sentence, to put an end to all doubts.[232] Thus we have a Bishop from the Patriarchate of Antioch imploring Rome to give a final judgment in a cause of faith; and the Roman Pontiff pronouncing his sentence, clearing the applicant of all imputation, and covering his enemies with confusion.[233] And the appeal of Theodoret to Pope Leo evidently proves that in his time the Roman See was regarded by all as the supreme court for causes of faith. For on the meeting of the Council of Chalcedon an objection was raised by some of the Bishops to the right of Theodoret to sit among them, which right, they said, he had forfeited by his writings espousing the cause of Nestorius against St. Cyril. Now it was answered by the judges that Theodoret had been already restored to his episcopal dignity by Pope Leo, and that by authority of the Pontiff he assumed the office of accuser.[234] But in the Eighth Session certain charges against Theodoret were laid before the Council, and he was called up to justify himself; and he having made his answer, as requested, the judges again inculcated what they had already said in the First Session, that Pope Leo had restored him to the communion of the Church and to his episcopal rank; and they invited the Assembly to give a decision in conformity with the

[232] L. c., p. 1316. *Ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ ὑμῶν θρόνου περιμένω τὴν ψῆφον· καὶ ἱκετεύω, καὶ ἀντιβολῶ τὴν σὴν ἁγιότητα, ἐπαμῦναί μοι τὸ ὀρθὸν ὑμῶν καὶ δίκαιον ἐπικαλουμένῳ κριτήριον, καὶ κελεῦσαι δραμεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐπιδεῖξαί μου τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς ἴχνεσιν ἑπομένην.*

[233] *Epist.* cxx. *S. Leonis M. ad Theodoretum Cyr.*, n. v. (Op., t. i., p. 1226. Edit. Ballerini).

[234] Concilium Chalcedonense, Act. i. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 874).

Papal sentence.[235] Thereupon all the Bishops exclaimed that Theodoret was worthy of the episcopal office, that Pope Leo, after God, had judged him.[236] From this we may derive the following conclusions:—1. The Synod acknowledged that the Roman See had the right to pass sentence in a cause of faith concerning a Bishop of the Antiochene Patriarchate, and to restore him to his dignity. 2. The sentence of Rome was sufficient to put him in communion with the Universal Church, and to enable him to take his seat in an Ecumenical Council. 3. Finally, the sentence passed by the Synod on the orthodoxy of Theodoret regarded only the personal dispositions of the Bishop with regard to Nestorius at the time of the Council itself; it did not affect in any manner the sentence of Pope Leo, whose judgment was next in authority to that of God; further, the Legates of the Pope, in pronouncing their final sentence, solemnly declared that Leo, Bishop of the Universal Church, had already given Catholic communion to Theodoret.[237]

But in the Lateran Synod under Pope Martin I., we find collected into one view proofs derived from various portions of the Church, and showing how universal was the persuasion that the Roman See had been divinely appointed as the ultimate arbiter in all questions of faith wheresoever they arose. This Council alone suffices to prove our point. The letter of the African Church to Pope Theodore,[238] and the *Libelli* of Stephen

[235] Concilium Chalcedonense, Act. viii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1524). *λείπεται τοίνυν ψῆφον ἐξενεχθῆναι παρὰ τῆς θεοφιλίας τῆς ὑμετέρας . . . καθὼς καὶ ὁ ὁσιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Λέων ἐδικαίωσεν.*

[236] *Ibid.* *μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λέων ἐδίκασεν.*

[237] *τὸν ἁγιώτατον καὶ σεβάσμιον ἐπίσκοπον Θεοδώρητον· καὶ ὁ ἁγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος πάσης ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος πόλεως Ῥώμης Λέων πάλιν εἰς κοινωνίαν ἐδέξατο τοῦτον* (*Ibid.*, p. 1525).

[238] In Conc. Lat. sub Martino, Secr. ii. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 131, seq.).

of Dora and of Sergius of Cyprus,[239] read in the Lateran Council, concur to afford the strongest proof of what we assert. The African Fathers copied in their address the words of Pope Innocent I. in his Letter to the Council of Carthage which we mentioned above. Now, it is just in that Letter that the Pope explicitly declares the right of the Apostolic See to examine and judge all causes of faith. The African Church, following in the footsteps of the great Pontiff, bears witness to the antiquity and universality of the practice of referring all the controversies of faith to the Roman See, and ascribes this usage to the privilege enjoyed by that See of being the immaculate and undefiled fountain of faith, from which all the Churches derive pure streams of doctrine. In like manner, the *Libellus* presented by Stephen of Dora in the same Lateran Council is a clear testimony to the same effect. He relates the mission which he received from Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, at the time when the Monothelite heresy was ravaging the Greek Empire. He tells how Sophronius took him to Mount Calvary, and imposed on him the strictest obligation to repair with all speed to Rome, in order to obtain from the Roman Pontiff a favourable sentence against the new sect. And he adds the reason why he was sent to Rome: because at Rome the foundations are laid of the orthodox dogma.[240] Sophronius then, in his embassy to Rome, proves that he regarded the Apostolic See as the supreme and infallible tribunal of faith. As to the *Libellus* of Sergius of Cyprus, the mere perusal of it will convince

[239] *Libellus Stephani Dorensis*, in Conc. Lat., Secr. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 105, seq.); *Libellus Sergii Cypriensis*, *Ibid.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 125, seq.).

[240] *ταχέως οὖν ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς πέρατα διέλθε, μέχρις οὗ εἰς τὸν ἀποστολικὸν καταντήσειας θρόνον, ἔνθα τῶν εὐσεβῶν δογμάτων εἰσὶν αἱ κρηπῖδες* (*Ibid.*, p. 108).

all that this Prelate, speaking the language of the Church of his age, exhibits the universal persuasion that the Pope is the supreme judge in matters of faith, and that he cannot err in his final decisions. What else is meant when it is said that the Roman Pontiff was constituted by Christ the immoveable foundation of faith, and its luminous symbol; that he is the principal destroyer of all heresies, and the teacher of the orthodox and immaculate faith; and that upon these titles Sergius bases his appeal to the Papal judgment; that from the Pope he expects strength to give steadiness to the faith tossed as it is by the winds of heresy, and to enlighten with the rays of his divine doctrine the darkness spread over all by unwise men?[241]

After these clear testimonies, we have no need to swell the present section with further quotations. But we cannot pass over the appeal to the Apostolic See from Theodorus Studita, and the noble letter which he addressed on that occasion to Pope Paschal.[242] After giving to the Pope the names of "Apostolic Head," "Pastor of Christ's sheep appointed by God," "Keeper of the gates of Heaven," "Rock of faith upon which the Catholic Church is built," "Peter himself, the ornament and the governor of his See," he continues: "Rise up, then, from the West, thou imitator of Christ. To thee Christ our Lord said—'And thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.' Behold the time, behold the place; give us help, thou to whom this office is intrusted by God; stretch towards us thy hand and help us. Thou hast received thy power from God, for thou art constituted the Prince of all. Terrify, we beseech thee, the wild beasts of heresy with the sword of thy divine word. Good Shepherd, give thy life for thy sheep. Let the whole Church which

[241] In Conc. Lat. cit., Secr. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 125).

[242] *Epist.*, l. ii., ep. xii., p. 1152, seq. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xcix.).

is under heaven hear that thou hast in thy Council anathematised all who dare to do such things, and to anathematise our holy Fathers. This would be acceptable to God, it would afford joy to the Angels and Saints, give strength to those who are shaken, solidity to those who are still firm; it would raise up the fallen, cause rejoicing to the whole Church of the Orthodox, and it would be an eternal monument to thy Headship, according as it has been to all those of old who have preceded thee, who, in similar times, inspired by the Holy Ghost, did that which we sinners request at present, and who are spoken of and held as blessed."[243] From this letter, as well as from the other,[244] in which Theodore and his Monks thank Pope Paschal for the benefit imparted to them, our readers can easily understand that the Apostolic See, long before the forgery of the False Decretals, was regarded even within the limits of the East as the supreme judge of faith, and its sentence was looked upon as inspired by the Holy Ghost, and as sufficient to consolidate the firm in faith, to give strength to the weak, and to recal to the path of truth those who had gone astray. These are the characteristics of an infallible judgment.

But in order to confirm and explain the truth established in this section, we must add that the Roman Pontiff was always regarded in antiquity as the supreme judge, whose decisions in matters of faith are not liable to be reconsidered by any earthly tribunal, and that his sentence was to be received by all without the least hesitation or tergiversation. This maxim was clearly expressed by Popes Nicholas I. and Leo IX. in the times when Photius and Cerularius were beginning and consummating the Greek schism. "The judgment of the Apostolic See," says Pope Nicholas, "whose

[243] L. c., p. 1153.
[244] *Epist.* xiii., l. ii. (Migne, l. c., p. 1153, seq.).

authority stands far above any other power, can be re-examined by no one, and no one is allowed to pronounce sentence against its judgments."[245] Pope Leo, too, in one of his Letters to Michael Cerularius, tells him that "he has incurred anathema from all the Fathers of all the venerable Synods, because he has dared to impeach the judgment of the Supreme See, which no one is permitted to judge."[246] Nor can it be said that Pope Nicholas was proposing any new maxim, which he might have derived from a forged Decretal.[247] He appealed to his predecessors, who had always held the same doctrine, and prescribed it to him; he referred to the very Canons, to which his predecessors had also referred. Pope Zosimus,[248] Pope Boniface,[249] Pope Gelasius,[250] and others, already had unmistakably exhibited the same doctrine. Pope Gelasius pointedly and repeatedly remarked that the whole Church is fully

[245] *Epist.* viii. *ad Michaelem Imp.* (Labbe, t. ix., p. 1339).

[246] *Epist.* i. *ad Michael. Cerul.*, cap. xi. (Labbe, t. xi., p. 1326).

[247] It is difficult to understand how some writers in Germany could believe that the doctrine expressed by Pope Nicholas in the above passage was taken from the forged Decretal ii. of Pope Marcellinus.

[248] *Epist.* xii. *ad Synod. Carthage*, n. i. (Coustant, p. 974). "De ejus (Sedis Apostolicæ) judicio disceptare nullus auderet, idque per canones semper regulasque servaverit," etc.

[249] *Epist.* xv. *ad Rufum cæterosque Episcopos Macedoniæ*, etc., n. 5 (Coustant, p. 1042). "Nemo unquam Apostolico culmini, de cujus judicio non licet retractari, manus obvias audacter intulit: nemo in hoc rebellis extitit, nisi qui de se voluit judicari," etc.

[250] *Epist.* xxvi. *ad Episc. Dardaniæ*, n. 5 (Thiel, *Epist. RR. PP.*, t. i., p. 399). "Cuncta per mundum novit Ecclesia, quoniam quorumlibet sententiis ligata pontificum sedes B. Petri Apostoli jus habet resolvendi, utpote quæ de omni Ecclesia fas habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio; siquidem ad illam de qualibet mundi parte canones appellare voluerint, ab illa autem nemo sit appellare permissus." He has the same remarks in the *Epist.* x. *ad Faustum*, n. 5 (Thiel, l. c., p. 343, seq.).

aware of the right enjoyed by the See of the Apostle St. Peter to pronounce judgment all over the Church, while no one is allowed to sit in judgment against its decisions, or to appeal from its sentence. And he refers to the Canons which sanction that practice. But besides the extracts quoted above, we find the very words used by Pope Nicholas in a Letter of Hadrian I., addressed in 790 to Charlemagne, that is to say, at least more than half a century before the forgery of the Pseudo-Decretals.[251] And this maxim was so deeply impressed on the mind of the Universal Church, that when the Arian King Theodoric assembled a numerous Synod to judge the grievous charges brought against Pope Symmachus, the Bishops solemnly declared that such was the authority conferred on the Successor of St. Peter that he was not liable to their judgment.[252] Likewise, when Charlemagne called upon the Prelates of France to sit as judges upon Pope Leo III., against whom certain calumnious accusations had been brought, they protested that they could not do so, frankly declaring that they dared not judge the Apostolic See, which is the Head of all the Churches; because they all were judged by that See and its Vicar, but he is

[251] "Quanta auctoritas B. Petro Apostolorum Principi ejusque sacratissimæ Sedi concessa est, cuiquam non ambigimus ignorari: utpote quæ de omnibus ecclesiis fas habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam liceat de ejus judicare judicio, quorumlibet sententiis ligata Pontificum Sedes B. Petri Apostoli jus habebit solvendi, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis Ecclesiæ cura confluit, et nihil unquam a suo capite dissidet" (*Epist. ad Carolum Regem*, in *Codice Carolino*, n. lxxxv. Edit. Migne, n. xcviii., *PP. LL.*, t. xcviii., p. 428).

[252] "Scientes quia ejus (Pontificis) sedi primum Petri Apostoli meritum vel principatus: deinde secreta jussionem Domini conciliorum venerandorum auctoritas ei singularem in Ecclesiis tradidit potestatem, nec antedictæ sedis antistitem minorum subjacuisse judicio," etc. (Synodus Rom. iii. Labbe, t. v., p. 457, seq.).

not judged by any one, as had always been the practice of antiquity. Hence they were ready to obey canonically the Pope in everything he should think proper to impose on them.[253] From these and many other documents, which we could adduce were it necessary, we must conclude that the Pope was always regarded as infallible in all his Apostolic utterances. For we have seen that he was always considered as the supreme judge of faith; that his sentence was always regarded as decisive without appeal or control, and at the same time obligatory on every man who wished himself to avoid condemnation by the sentence. And in conformity with this, Nicholas I. expressly condemned all who should resist the decisions of the Apostolic See.[254] Now if the Pope is the judge of faith without any control and appeal, if his judgments are to be regarded as strictly binding on the whole Church, he must undoubtedly be infallible. Otherwise, the Universal Church, which rests on faith, would lean on error, on account of the unreserved submission of all the Faithful, Bishops and people alike, to the erroneous definitions of the Roman Pontiff. In this case the constitution of the Church would be accountable for the evil which would follow from it. Certainly it is in the essence of the constitution of the Church that the Apostolic See should be the supreme tribunal of faith. We have seen that all those who bear witness in antiquity to this prerogative of the Holy See, refer it

[253] "Universi Archiepiscopi et Episcopi et abbates unanimiter audientes dixerunt: Nos Sedem Apostolicam, quæ est caput omnium Ecclesiarum, judicare non audemus; nam ab ipsa nos omnes et vicario suo judicamur, ipsa autem a nemine judicatur, quemadmodem et antiquitus mos fuit: sed sicut ipse summus Pontifex censuerit, canonice obedimus" (In *Vita Leonis III.*, Anastasii Biblioth. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. cxxviii., p. 1218).

[254] Conc. Rom. iii., cap. v. (Labbe, t. x., p. 238).

to the supremacy which Christ had conferred, for the constitution of the Church implies the divine supremacy upon which it was built. Now if, according to the constitution of the Church, the Apostolic See has final jurisdiction to judge all causes of faith, without appeal, so that its decisions are binding on the whole Church, all error forced on all the Church must undoubtedly be attributed to the defect and imperfection of its constitution. And we have the word of God for the perfection of this constitution, which word guarantees the Church from error; we must then conclude that, in virtue of the same constitution of the Church, the Apostolic See has the divine privilege of infallibility in all the definitive utterances of its universal *magisterium.*

Mgr. Maret speaks of the maxim of all Catholic antiquity, that the Apostolic See cannot be judged by any, and mentions the passages quoted above from Popes Boniface and Gelasius. But it is extraordinary to find him maintaining that the assertion of antiquity and of the Pontiffs must be understood with limitation. That is to say, the words of Popes Boniface and Gelasius do not mean that the Pope cannot be judged by an Ecumenical Council; otherwise, "les troisième, quatrième, cinquième, sixième, septième et huitième Conciles Ecuméniques ont fait des entreprises illicites en soummettant à un examen juridique plusieurs décrets et décisions des Pontifes Romains."[255] It is extraordinary, I say; because the Prelate rests all his remarks on two false suppositions; first, the belief that Popes Boniface and Gelasius had held principles identical on this point with those of the old Gallican School, and recognised in a General Council such an authority as to give force of law to its Decrees, even when without or against Papal authority; secondly, that General Councils had in some cases

[255] *Du Concile Général*, l. iv., ch. xi., t. ii., p. 200.

exercised a true juridical power over a living Pontiff. As we have repeatedly urged, no power of legislating was ever recognised by all antiquity in any ecclesiastical body, without the confirming and sanctioning authority of the Roman Pontiff. How can, then, Mgr. Maret believe that a power could exist in the Church whose Decrees, in opposition to a living and certain Pontiff, would have force of law; that therefore Popes Boniface and Gelasius implied such an exception when they asserted that no one can judge the sentence of the Apostolic See? As to the other supposition concerning historical facts, we shall soon proceed to show its falsity by the documents of history.

SECTION VI.

THE ROMAN PONTIFF REGARDED AS SUPREME JUDGE OF HERESY DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES. ST. CYPRIAN AND POPE ST. STEPHEN.

POPE MARTIN I. solemnly proclaimed in the Lateran Council that it belongs to Peter and his See to shut the Kingdom of Heaven against faithless heretics, and to pass judgment on all doctrines contrary to the Catholic faith and to the pure tradition of the Fathers.[256] In that very age the great Confessor of faith, St. Maximus, announced the same maxim in the East, asserting that it is the Roman See which shuts the tongue of every heretic who proudly speaks against justice.[257] It was then with good reason that various Popes, and especially Leo IX., reminded Michael Cerularius that to overthrow heresies had always been the work of the Apostolic See; and that this See had already destroyed as many as ninety heresies which had arisen in the East, defiling the purity of the Catholic Church.[258] Pope Leo spoke the truth, and his language is the language of all antiquity, evidenced by historical documents. Careful and conscientious study of ecclesiastical history cannot lead to any other conclusion. It is said by Mr. Palmer, and Dr. Pusey repeats the remark, that even before the Council of Nicæa, more

[256] In Conc. Lat., Secr. ii. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 162).

[257] In Opusculis ad Marinum, *Ex Epist. Romæ scripta* (Op., t. ii., p. 140. Edit. Migne).

[258] *Epist.* i. *Leonis IX. ad Michaelem Cerularium*, nn. vii., viii. (Labbe, t. xi., p. 1323).

than ninety heresies were suppressed by the arguments and authority of Bishops and provincial Synods.[259] But these writers are mistaken in supposing that if the voice of the supreme tribunal of Rome had been silent, the arguments and the authorities of the individual Bishops, or of their provincial Synods, would have availed to suppress throughout the world the heresies which arose and were extensively propagated in the first three centuries of the Church. The historical records bearing upon the point have lately received an important addition in the *Philosophumena* published under the name of Origen. In this section we will examine as closely as existing documents render it possible to do, how the authority of the Roman Pontiffs manifested its power in condemning and suppressing heresies wherever they arose in the first three centuries of the Church. It is true that history has preserved to us few and scanty records of that period; nevertheless, the few facts transmitted to us will suffice to show what was in that time the supreme tribunal authorised to reject and condemn the erroneous and heretical doctrines put forth by enemies of the Church.

The most formidable foe that arose to meet the Church in the field of controversy in the first three centuries of her existence was the sect of Gnostics. The doctrines of this sect comprised and blended together various elements derived from Platonism, as cultivated by the Jews of Alexandria, from the old religions of Egypt and Asia, and from the Christian Scriptures and the tradition of the Church. It aimed at nothing less than the overthrow of Christianity; and its adherents, all bent upon this design, were spread over Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor. But they also made special efforts to follow the example of their master, Simon Magus of Samaria, and endeavoured

[259] *Eirenicon*, p. 89.

to establish themselves in the city "where the foundations of the Christian Church are laid." From the very beginning we find the Gnostics anxious either to gain the favour of the Bishop of Rome himself, or at least to scatter their errors among his immediate flock. The Gnostic faction crept into Rome in the persons of Valentine, the principal chief and most influential representative of the Gnostic School of Alexandria, and of Cerdon and Marcion, who may be considered as the leaders of the Gnostic School of Asia Minor, and whose systems, though seemingly less directly opposed to Christianity than that of Valentine, were really no less dangerous to revealed truth. But as Simon, the first of the Gnostics, was defeated at Rome by St. Peter, so did the Successors of the Prince of the Apostles triumph over the representatives of the Samaritan magician. Following the plan which had been so commonly adopted by heretics in every age, Valentine feigned to hold Catholic principles, that by this pretence he might be enabled to insinuate his poisonous doctrines into the hearts of the simple.[260] But the Roman Church could not be deceived by his heretical artifices. He was there unmasked, and twice anathematised and condemned by the Apostolic See; first under Pope Hyginus, and again under Pius I.[261] At length, despairing of success in his endeavour to defile the immaculate Church of Rome, he repaired to the island of Cyprus, and ran headlong into the abyss of every iniquity and immorality,[262] and although his sect was widely spread in the East, in Egypt and Asia Minor, no sooner was

[260] S. Irenæus, Præf. in l. i. *Contra Hæreses*, p. 2. Edit. Maur.

[261] Tertullianus, *De Præscriptionibus*, cap. xxx. (Op., t. ii., p. 42. Edit. Migne); Eusebius, in *Chronicon an.* 144 (Op., t. i., p. 560. Edit. Migne).

[262] S. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xxxi., n. 7 (Op., t. i., p. 171. Edit. Petavii).

it struck with the Pontifical anathema than it withered away; not enduring the full exposure of its errors made by St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and the author of the *Philosophumena.* Towards the middle of the fourth century, St. Gregory Nazianzen spoke of the Valentinian system as of an old fable.[263] This case, if it stood alone, might not be of itself sufficient to prove our point; but when taken in conjunction with the other instances which we shall adduce, it will be found to have great weight.

Cerdon likewise, the Gnostic leader from Asia Minor, came to Rome, and endeavoured to spread his errors in the Apostolic Church. But his deceits were brought to light, and he was cast out of the Church by Pope Hyginus.[264] When he applied for readmission, after having recanted his errors, admission was mercifully granted to him; but his hypocrisy soon appeared anew, and he separated himself from the Church of God, remaining under the anathema fulminated against him by the Apostolical See.[265] Marcion, his disciple, being unable to deceive the Church of Rome, which declined to receive him into its bosom, joined Cerdon, and moulding to a new fashion the Gnostic theories of the other, used every endeavour to spread them widely at Rome, and elsewhere. But, like his predecessors, he was crushed by the Doctors of the Church, who had drawn their learning from the original tradition of Rome, and who regarded him as a man cut off from that Church, communion with which they regarded as the essential character of orthodoxy.[266]

[263] *Orat.* xxxi., n. 7 (Op., t. i., p. 560. Edit. Parisiis, 1778).

[264] S. Irenæus, l. iii., cap. iv., n. 3, p. 178.

[265] S. Irenæus, l. c., p. 179.

[266] S. Irenæus, l. iii., cap. iv., n. 3, pp. 178, 179; S. Epiphanius, *Hæresis* xlii., p. 302, seq. (Op., t. i. Edit. Petavii). St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Epiphanius, and others of the ancient Fathers, refuted at length the errors of Marcion and his followers.

But the manifold sects of the Gnostics had no proper claim to the Christian name, being bent on upsetting every principle of revelation, and dealing out the philosophical dreams by which they tried to represent the speculative part of Christian doctrine. Montanism, on the other hand, was opposite to Gnosticism, not only inasmuch as it concerned the practical life of Christianity, but also because it laid claim to the gift of prophecy, and proclaimed new revelations: calculated, as was said, to develop and perfect the rules of Christian life. Nevertheless, this heresy was no less fatal than Gnosticism to Catholic doctrine, and it received an immense accession of strength when it gained over Tertullian, who must be considered both for genius and learning one of the most distinguished men who flourished in the second and third centuries. But the death-blow which proved fatal to that sect and heresy was inflicted by the Apostolic See in the person of Pope Zephyrinus. Tertullian speaks of this edict as *peremptory*, and styles the Pope who enacted it as the Sovereign Pontiff, and the Bishop of the Bishops.[267] It is true that Tertullian when he wrote these words was a Montanist, but he merely expressed the persuasion of the whole Catholic Church. In fact, when the Churches of Asia Minor, in their distress at the errors of Montanism, applied to the Church of Lyons for advice, for the purpose of counteracting the evil of the spreading heresy, the holy Martyrs of Lyons answered by pointing out to them the authority of the Pope as the most effectual means to put an end to the disease. Moreover, on their own behalf, they addressed a letter to Pope Eleutherius, and intrusted St. Irenæus with a mission to him for the same purpose of checking the

[267] *De Pudicitia*, cap. i. (Op., t. ii., p. 981. Edit. Migne). "Audio edictum esse propositum et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex scilicet maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum dixit," etc.

invading error, and giving peace to the Churches of the East. Eleutherius, like his predecessor Soter, opposed and rejected the error, but he abstained from pronouncing a final and solemn condemnation, because he entertained some hope of bringing the sectarians into the path of truth: trusting to the solid refutations of the doctrines set forth by Miltiades, Rhodanus, and Apollonius.[268] Pope Victor was deceived by the artifices of the Montanists, and believing in their sincerity and honesty, he was on the point of sending to them Letters of communion.[269] But finally, Zephyrinus, persuaded that the long-suffering and merciful conduct of the Apostolic See had only contributed to encourage the pride and audacity of the sect, acted as a supreme judge by pronouncing a final sentence of condemnation. It is true that several Synods were held about the same time in Asia, which comprised some of the most ancient Churches of the Christian world, and the Bishops had already condemned the heresy, and anathematised Montanus and his followers.[270] But these Churches did not venture to pronounce their judgment before having applied for advice to the West, nor did they speak until they were informed of the judgments of Soter and of Eleutherius. So that the Apostolic See was even to them the infallible guide against error and heresy.[271]

[268] *Prædestinatus*, cap. lxxxvi. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. liii., p. 616); Tertullianus, *In Praxeam*, cap. i. (Op., t. ii., p. 155, seq. Edit. Migne). See Tillemont, *Mém. pour l'Hist. Eccl.*, t. ii., p. iii.; *Not.* iii. *sur les Montanistes*, p. 124. Bruxelles, 1695.

[269] Tertullianus, l. c. See Tillemont, Op. cit., n. iv., l. c., p. 125, seq., and Pagi, *Crit. in Baronium*, an. 171, n. 3, t. i., p. 166. Antuerpiæ.

[270] See *Conc. Hierapolitanum*, in Labbe, t. i., p. 594; Eusebius, l. v., cap. xvi., p. 181.

[271] See Tillemont, l. c., *Art.* ii., iii., *sur les Montanistes*, p. 36, seq. We do not see any reason for placing the Synod in question

Towards the end of the second century, and in the course of the third, the Catholic Church was attacked in its very foundations by the manifold sects which opposed or corrupted the doctrine of the Trinity. These heresies were possessed with a spirit destructive of Christianity; they taught in an absolute sense the *monarchy* in the Holy Trinity, and represented the Three Persons as different denominations of God; they therefore denied the divinity of Christ, and considered Him as no more than a virtuous and learned man. The first leader of this heretical party, whose name has come down to us, is Theodotus of Byzantium. He, like so many heretics after him, went to Rome, in order, if possible, to implant his error on the See of the first Apostle; but that very See pronounced anathema against him and his followers. Pope Victor condemned his errors, and issued a sentence of excommunication against their author.[272] In this manner the Roman Pontiff proclaimed the divinity of Christ, and raised up the standard of the Catholic doctrine against all future enemies. In vain Artemon endeavoured to appeal to the tradition of the Apostolic See in order to deceive the Faithful and upset the fundamental dogma of Christianity;[273] in vain Paul of Samosata endeavoured to give a new shape and appearance to the

before 150, as Dr. Hefele thinks (*Hist. des Conciles*, t. i., l. i., ch. i., sec. i., p. 79, seq. Paris, 1869). We prefer the chronology of Tillemont, which seems to us more in accordance with the facts. At all events, even if the Synod should be referred to some year before 150, the purport of our argument would be the same. Because in that case, even after the decision of the Synod, the Bishops of Asia apply to the Western Church to seek help in their troubles. From the Western Church came the peremptory blow which was to prostrate Montanism. Tertullian himself qualified as peremptory the condemnation pronounced by Pope Eleutherius.

[272] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. v., cap. xxviii., p. 196.

[273] Eusebius, l. c.

condemned heresy of Theodotus. The decision and the *magisterium* of Pope Victor stood out in opposition to them; and the Synod of Antioch could safely anathematise Theodotus, and depose him from the episcopal chair which he had disgraced with his errors (A.D. 269).[274] The judgment of the Assembly of Antioch was an echo of that which Pope Victor had issued at Rome against Theodotus.

But while Paul of Samosata was troubling with his heresy the Patriarchate of Antioch, Sabellius tried to introduce his heretical maxims into that of Alexandria. This new heresiarch developed the error of Beryllus, and reduced the Persons of the Godhead to merely different operations of one Being. Dionysius, Patriarch of Alexandria, wrote three letters in refutation of the heresy, and sent legates to the province of Pentapolis, where Sabellius had gained a large number of proselytes. In doing this, Dionysius discharged his duty as a Bishop. But he knew well what was the tribunal to which causes of faith properly belonged, and by which all heresies were peremptorily condemned. Therefore he addressed letters to Pope Xystus II., informing him of the nature of the new heresy, and submitting to the Papal judgment the refutation which he had published against it.[275] But Xystus died before the condemnation of Sabellianism was pronounced by the Apostolic See. Dionysius, his successor, authoritatively rejected the heresy, and put forth as a standard of faith a clear explanation of the Catholic dogma concerning the Three Divine Persons and the Incarnation of the Word of God. We owe to St. Athanasius the preservation of an admirable fragment of that Letter.[276] But let us

[274] See the *Acta Conc. Antiocheni*, in Labbe, t. i., p. 907, seq.; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. vii., capp. xxvii.—xxx., p. 277, seq.

[275] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. vii., cap. vi., p. 252.

[276] See it in Coustant, *Epist.* ii. *Dionysii Papæ Fragment.*, p. 274.

remark an incident in the controversy which is important to our argument. Dionysius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, having written three letters, as we noticed, against Sabellius, was accused before the Pope of the same name, as having himself insinuated erroneous opinions regarding the divinity of the Eternal Word.[277] The Pontiff, after having assembled a Synod at Rome, and carefully examined the accusations brought against the writings of Dionysius, called upon the Patriarch to explain and justify his doctrines.[278] We must not forget that the See of Alexandria, as a Patriarchal see, was second only to that of Rome; and yet Dionysius humbly submitted to the requirement of the Pope, without raising the least objection, or making any complaint whatever, either against the Pontiff's jurisdiction or against the manner in which it was exercised. He knew well that the Pope was the judge without appeal in the causes of faith, and that to him had been committed the charge to preserve the integrity of the Catholic doctrine against error and heresy; therefore, in compliance with the demand, he forwarded to Rome a full explanation of his doctrines.[279] By this conduct he practically acknowledged the principle for which we are contending.

In the course of the same third century another controversy arose, which, although in itself bearing on Catholic dogmas, did not cause any real breach in the unity of the Church, this misfortune being averted by the prudence and foresight of the principal Bishops. We mean the great controversy on the validity of the baptism conferred by heretics. Several Bishops of

[277] *Epist. S. Athanasii de Sententia Dionysii*, n. 13 (Op., t. i., p. 198. Edit. Patavii).

[278] *Ibid.*, l. c., et n. 14, p. c.

[279] S. Athanasius, l. c., n. 13, p. 198; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. vii., cap. xxvi., p. 277.

Africa, and among them St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage; and some of Asia Minor, with Firmilian, Bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, maintained that the baptism conferred by heretics was void of efficacy to regenerate the soul; that consequently those who had been baptised by heretics must be baptised again when received into the Catholic Church. Three African Synods under St. Cyprian unanimously approved this doctrine, and resisted the orders of Pope Stephen, who had prohibited the practice of rebaptising those who had been baptised by heretics. Some able writers of the last century endeavoured to prove that all the documents relating to the controversy between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian were a forgery of the Donatists,[280] and more recently, Archbishop Tizzani in an elaborate work adopted the same view, and collected arguments and documents of all kinds to prove the spuriousness of the testimonies concerning that controversy.[381] Many, no doubt, will feel great difficulty in accepting the conclusions of his learned work; and will refuse to reject as forgeries all the writings in question. But this is not the place to analyse Tizzani's work, and to weigh his arguments. The Abbé Bouix, in his recent treatise, *De Papâ*, adopts the Archbishop's view, and represents it as at least most probable. But perhaps very few among modern critics will be persuaded by the arguments of Mgr. Tizzani and the Abbé. Although we could easily allow that some of the documents have been more or less adulterated by the Donatists, yet we do not think that all the controversy is *a fable*. At all

[280] In 1733 Missorius published in Venice his *Disputationes criticæ in duas celebres Epistolas Firmiliani et Cypriani.* In 1730 Molkembuhr, a Franciscan, wrote two dissertations on the spuriousness of the Epistle of Firmilian to St. Cyprian. See them in Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. iii., p. 1357, seq.

[281] *La celebre contesa fra S. Stefano e S. Cipriano.* Roma, 1862.

events it is undesirable to rest the defence of Papal Infallibility on so disputable a ground; we prefer to meet the objection directly, accepting all the documents which are brought forward by our adversaries. We limit our remarks in this volume to the question of Papal Infallibility, with which the objection is principally concerned. This controversy may be considered under a two-fold aspect. First, it may be asked whether the contest between St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen directly affects the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; and secondly, whether it affords any proof that in the age of St. Cyprian this doctrine was not known in the Church. As to the first question, we assert that the fact of the controversy itself is a vindication of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

In the whole controversy we may distinguish two parties. On the one side we see one of the most eminent Prelates of his age, and a large number of Bishops of Africa and Asia Minor, supported by the authority of many influential Synods, maintaining the necessity of a second Baptism when the first had been received at the hands of heretics or schismatics, and the advocates of this opinion produced in its support so large an amount of Biblical and theological reasoning that it is difficult to answer the difficulties which they raised. On the other hand we have the Roman Pontiff, seemingly alone; but confident that the consent of the Universal Church was with him, and armed with the traditional *magisterium* of the Apostolic See, he stands forward and unhesitatingly proclaims the doctrine of the unity of Baptism, threatening to use the censures of the Church against all who should oppose the truth which he inculcated.[282] Now, what was the result of the contest? Although Pope Stephen did not pronounce

[282] See S. Dionysii Alexandrini, *Epist. ad Xystum* (Penes Euseb., l. vii., cap. v., p. 252).

any solemn definition of faith, yet his Decree was regarded as the guiding principle for all the Church. Therefore those who had followed the false opinion as to the effect of heretical baptism, rejected their error and submitted to the traditional doctrine as pointed out by Pope Stephen;[283] and if we may give credence to St. Jerome, the African Prelates, by a new Decree, repealed what had been enacted in the preceding Synod.[284] St. Cyprian himself, according to St. Augustine, must have rejected his wrong opinion, although no record of his submission has been handed down to us.[285] On the contrary, as is remarked by Vincent of Lerins, the Decree of the African Council had no root and no vital force whatever; all that it endeavoured to establish failed and vanished away as a dream, as a fable, as a superfluity.[286] And those, continues the same writer, who persisted in following and asserting it, were judged as heretics and condemned; but those who professed the doctrine of Pope Stephen were held to be true Catholics.[287] Two great Councils, those of Arles (314) and of Nicæa (325), did not take for the rule of their judgments the Synods held in Africa and Asia Minor, nor the vehement letters of St. Cyprian, nor the insulting declamation of Firmilian, Bishop of Cesarea: but they were guided by the Edict

[283] S. Hieronymus, *Dialog. contra Luciferianos*, n. 23 (Op., t. iii., p. 178. Migne).

[284] *Ibid.*, l. c.

[285] S. Augustinus, *Epist.* xciii. *ad Vincentium Rog.*, cap. x., n. 38 (Op., t. i., p. 340. Migne).

[286] Vincentius Lirinensis, *Commonitorium* i., cap. vi., p. 646 (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. l.). "Ipsius Africani concilii sive decreti quæ vires? Donante Deo nullæ," etc.

[287] *Ibid.* "Auctores ejusdem opinionis Catholici, consectatores vero hæretici judicantur; absolvuntur magistri, condemnantur discipuli."

published by Pope Stephen.[288] Truth was with the Pontiff, who judged in virtue of his supreme authority in the Church, but truth was not with the many Synods which unanimously condemned heretical baptism; nor was it with those Bishops who did not submit their judgment to the traditional *magisterium* of the Roman Church. The conflict furnishes us a new argument that the Roman Pontiff is, and has always been regarded as, the supreme infallible judge of Catholic dogma, and of the orthodoxy of every theological proposition.[289]

Let us now proceed to consider the question under the other aspect. Does the conduct of St. Cyprian and the other Bishops concerned, imply the persuasion that the Roman Pontiff had not the singular prerogative of infallibility? We answer in the negative.[290] Two points must be established by those who maintain the affirmative. First, that St. Cyprian regarded the whole controversy as a controversy of faith; and secondly, that he considered the Decree of Pope Stephen as a definitive utterance of his supreme doctrinal *magisterium* in the Universal Church. The reason is that no Edict

[288] Conc. Arel., cap. viii. (Labbe, t. i., p. 1451); Conc. Nicænum, Can. xix. (Labbe, t. ii., p. 42).

[289] The learned Thommassin has given us an erudite dissertation proving that the doctrine of Pope Stephen was perfectly in accord with the teaching of the Fathers (*Diss.* ii. *ad Syn. in Causa Bapt. Hæret.*, p. 11, seq. Lucæ, 1728). In another dissertation by an anonymous writer (In Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. iii., p. 1314, seq.), the author produces documents to prove that the correct view of St. Cyprian's case on heretical baptism was taken by the principal Bishops and theologians of the French Church.

[290] Cardinal d'Aguirre admits that St. Cyprian and his colleagues did not believe in Papal Infallibility. Nevertheless, he maintains that their private persuasions do not constitute any difficulty against the Papal prerogative. We think, on the contrary, that those Prelates were dealing with a very different matter, and that no question arose concerning Papal Infallibility.

of the Pope is an exercise of his infallible teaching unless, first, it concern teaching, and secondly, be imposed on the Church as a truth either belonging to the *depositum* of revealed truths or closely connected with it. If the first character be wanting to a Papal Edict it is not an object of faith; if the second, it is not binding on the Faithful. Now St. Cyprian regarded the controversy of the second Baptism as a controversy of discipline, and of privileges belonging to particular Churches. In fact, he was well aware that the custom of rebaptising those who came to the Church from heretical communions, had been introduced into the African Church only in the time of Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage,[291] but he thought the new custom to be more reasonable and more conformable with the principles of faith.[292] Nevertheless, he did not believe that those who followed the contrary custom ought to be forced to give it up or to be condemned on that account,[293] for he was persuaded that the controversy between him and Pope Stephen concerned only a matter of disciplinary arrangement.[294] This is the reason why he did not think that those infants were

[291] S. Cyprian, *Epist.* lxxiii. *ad Jubajanun* (Baluzii, p. 130). See also St. Augustine, *De Baptismo*, l. ii., capp. vii., viii., nn. 11—13 (Op., t. ix., pp. 133—134; l. iii., cap. xii., n. 17, p. 145).

[292] *Epist.* lxxi. *ad Quintum*, l. c., p. 127; *Epist.* lxxiii., cit., p. 133; *Epist.* lxxii. *ad Stephanum Papam*, p. 128.

[293] *Epist.* lxxvi. *ad Magnum*, p. 158; *Epist.* lxxii., p. 129; *Epist.* lxxiii., p. 137.

[294] *Epist.* lxxii., p. 129. "Hæc (the Acts of the Synod of Carthage) ad conscientiam tuam, frater carissime, et pro honore communi et pro simplici dilectione pertulimus, credentes etiam tibi pro religionis tuæ et pro fidei veritate placere quæ religiosa pariter et vera sunt. Cæterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint, nolle deponere nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria quæ apud se semel sint usurpata retinere, qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus."

lost who had departed this life with no baptism but that conferred by heretics; for he considered that they were linked by a bond of unity with the Catholic Church, and this would have been impossible had not their baptism been valid.[295] This proves that St. Cyprian regarded the controversy on rebaptism merely as disciplinary. Unquestionably, the characters of a controversy of *faith* are quite different to those which were attributed by the holy Martyr to that in which he was engaged. In fact, a doctrine of faith has no other origin and beginning except from Christ and His Apostles. Moreover, a doctrine of faith is enforced on every one of the Faithful, so that whosoever refuses submission is excluded from the pale of the Church. Finally, infants not duly baptised could not be within the Catholic unity, since it is by Baptism that we are incorporated in Christ; nor can infants supply the want of that Sacrament by a lively faith informed with charity. We are, then, unmistakably forced to conclude that St. Cyprian regarded the whole controversy as disciplinary.

This is the more clear because the holy Doctor knew well that his opinion was not backed by the whole Church, nor even by a majority of Catholic Bishops. St. Cyprian not only never makes appeal to any ancient practice of the Church, but he plainly confesses that even in Africa he was not supported by any ancient custom in the matter; for, as we remarked just now, the old custom had been changed as lately as the time of Agrippinus. Moreover, he never denies the reality of the contrary custom of the Church which his adversaries objected to him. The custom which was objected to by St. Cyprian and his party was, in fact,

[295] St. Augustine often bore witness to this persuasion of St. Cyprian. See, for instance, *De Baptismo*, l. ii., cap. xiii., n. 18 (Op., t. ix., p. 138. Edit. cit.).

that of all the Churches, not excluding the old African Church itself.[296] Especially, Pope Stephen did not mean any other kind of custom than what was established in the whole Church by an immemorial and illimited tradition. Even Bossuet and many other Gallican theologians were of this opinion.[297] Nay, they frankly asserted, not only that St. Cyprian regarded the whole controversy as disciplinary,[298] but also that he was aware of the practice proclaimed by Pope Stephen being the practice of the whole Church.[299] On this subject we have the authority of St. Augustine himself, who most explicitly asserts what we say. The holy Doctor not only maintained, with the other Fathers of his age, that the practice of receiving heretics into the Church without a second Baptism was the traditional practice of the Universal Church, but also that St. Cyprian and his colleagues, during the time of their contest with Pope Stephen, were certainly acquainted with this practice. St. Augustine testifies this clearly in many places of his work on Baptism against the Donatists. He says that St. Cyprian did not refuse to admit the fact of the universal practice of the Church, but he believed that it should be changed into a better one, because it was not supported by good reasons, and with all his learning he was unable to find in antiquity any instance against that universal practice, except the Synod of Bishop Agrippinus.[300] Again, St. Augustine

[296] See *Anonymum Auctorem: lib. de Rebaptismate*, n. 1 (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. iii., p. 1184).

[297] *Defen. Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xiv., cap. vii., t. ii., p. 266.

[298] See Habert, in *Tract. de Sacramentis*, quæst. iii., art. i., sec. iv., puncto ii., p. 31. Paris, 1710.

[299] See on this subject *Dissertatio historico-dogmatica*, pt. i., cap. i. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. iii., p. 1314, seq.). The author of the dissertation has put together a great number of extracts from Gallican theologians bearing on this subject.

[300] See *Diss.* cit., pt. i., cap. ii., p. 1320, seq.

explicitly asserts that not only St. Cyprian, but also the Bishops assembled in Synod at Carthage, knew perfectly what was the universal practice of the Church.[301] And he remarks that this important fact is testified by St. Cyprian as well as by his Synod in their own letters.[302] Now from all this we must conclude that, if St. Cyprian and the African Bishops were persuaded that the contrary custom of receiving the heretics without a second Baptism was the practice of the Universal Church, including the African province till the age of Agrippinus, they must have regarded the controversy as turning on a question of discipline. For had they believed any doctrine of faith to be involved, their contention would have amounted to a denial of infallibility to the Church itself; they would have been maintaining that the whole Church before Agrippinus had solemnly taught an error concerning the Sacrament of Baptism: and that in their own age the African Church alone was in possession of the truth, while the great majority of the Catholic Bishops, with the Roman Pontiff himself, were still in the darkness of error. Moreover, they would have been upholding the absurdity that Catholic doctrine may change and be improved after two centuries of traditional mistakes and errors, and that the universal tradition is not for the Church the source and the solid foundation of the Catholic doctrine. Unless we would admit such absurdities to have been maintained by St. Cyprian and his colleagues, we must decidedly affirm that they did not believe the controversy to be more than disciplinary: the African Church endeavouring to preserve a custom and a discipline which it believed

[301] *De Baptismo*, l. iv., cap. vi. (l. c., p. 159).

[302] *De Baptismo*, l. vii., cap. ii. (l. c., p. 226); cap. xxv. (p. 234).

[303] *Epist.* xciii. *ad Rogatianum*, cap. x., n. 38 (Op., t. ii., p. 340. Edit. Migne).

more satisfactory and more conformable even to faith. But if they considered themselves engaged in a disciplinary controversy, as is manifest, all difficulty against Papal Infallibility vanishes away, and the fact of their resistance to the Decree of Pope Stephen does not tend to prove that they did not believe in Papal Infallibility. For even admitting it, they might still resist a Decree which abolished a privilege and a custom of their province.

And the Decree of Pope Stephen, as we have said, was certainly not a dogmatic definition. The Pontiff pointed out what was the custom of the whole Church, that those who had been baptised by heretics or schismatics should be received, with no ceremony beyond the imposition of hands in sign of penance. He asserted that this was the custom handed down from the Apostles; and therefore he commanded that no change should be made in this traditional rite.[304] Pope Stephen did not impose on St. Cyprian and the others the duty of believing or condemning any doctrine whatever concerning the validity of heretical and schismatical baptism, but only the observance of a point of traditional discipline. The Decree doubtless implied the doctrine which later was settled by an Ecumenical Council; because that universal custom of the Church, which owed its origin to the Apostles, could not be understood without the dogma of the validity of the heretical baptism which it contained. Nevertheless, the doctrine was not yet binding on the Faithful, as it was not yet proposed in a definitive manner by the Sovereign Pontiff. St. Cyprian and the other Eastern Bishops resisted, because they regarded it as turning merely on a point of discipline, and they looked on

[304] Decretum Stephani Papæ, in *Epist. S. Cypriani et Firmiliani.* See it in Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, n. 14, p. 11. Fourth edition. 1865.

Pope Stephen's Decree as an attempt to abolish a provincial privilege and custom of the African Church. We do not excuse the fact of the unlawful resistance of St. Cyprian and of the Eastern Bishops, and we willingly admit the force of the excuses made by St. Augustine, concerning the intentions of St. Cyprian; nevertheless, we do not hesitate to declare that the fact of his obstinate opposition to the Pontifical Decree deserved to be punished with ecclesiastical censures. No blame could have justly attached to St. Stephen had he proceeded at once to the excommunication of St. Cyprian and of the Eastern Bishops, instead of adopting the more charitable course which he preferred; he would have been quite justified even in the eyes of the Gallican School.[305] St. Cyprian and his adherents were certainly guilty before the Church, if not of heresy, at least of disobedience to an order issued by the Apostolical See, and which was supported by the practice of all the Churches and by Apostolical tradition. But there is no difficulty in understanding how St. Cyprian was led in the course of the controversy to separate the disciplinary practice from the dogmatical doctrine, although the two were in fact necessarily connected. The reason is this: he, in common with all the *Rebaptizantes* of his age, agreed that the character impressed by Baptism when once duly administered renders it impossible to repeat the ceremony; but they argued that baptism administered by heretics and schismatics was necessarily invalid, for these being cut off from the Church, and from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, could not impart to others a gift of which

[305] Delahaye expressly says that if Pope Stephen had inflicted excommunication on St. Cyprian and the other Bishops, the censure would have been most just and well deserved. See *De Baptismo*, cap. iii., art. ii.

they themselves were deprived; and thus, according to the remark of St. Augustine, they confounded the question of the existence of the Sacrament with that of its effect.[306] At the same time, St. Cyprian did not condemn the practice of the other Churches; because, first, the doctrine of the validity of the heretical and schismatical baptism had not yet been defined as a doctrine of faith; and, secondly, because he believed that when a heretic was received into the body of the one Church the defect of true Baptism could in some cases be supplied, so that the ceremony of reception obtained for the convert a participation in the Holy Ghost and His gifts, which he had not received in baptism at the hands of heretics. He accounted in the same way for the case of infants who die in the Church with no baptism but that administered by heretics or schismatics. Pope Stephen too, as we remarked above, while ordering that the traditional Apostolic practice should be observed, left untouched the doctrinal controversy. We here see the meaning of St. Augustine when he said that the Decrees of particular Synods concerning heretical baptism were not firm until all doubts were entirely dispelled, and what before had been profitably believed was confirmed by the authority of a Plenary Council of the whole world.[307] The holy Doctor spoke there historically, not in the sense which Mgr. Maret erroneously attributes to his words.[308] The Bishop of Sura does not admit that St. Cyprian and the others regarded the controversy as one of discipline; he thinks that Pope Stephen did really pronounce a definition of faith, to which St. Cyprian refused to submit because he

[306] See St. Augustine, *De Baptismo*, l. v., cap. xxiii., n. 33 (p. 193); et l. vi., cap. i., n. i. (p. 197).

[307] Op. cit., l. i., cap. vii., n. 9, p. 114.

[308] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. ii., t. i., p. 155, seq.

looked on it as liable to error, no General Council having yet settled the question in a definitive manner. How many baseless suppositions have we here! In the view of St. Augustine, Pope Stephen, led by prudence and charity, abstained from pronouncing a dogmatical definition; succeeding Popes followed in his steps. It was by the Council of Arles, and much more by the General Council of Nicæa, that the doctrine was confirmed which teaches the validity of heretical baptism if administered in the name of the Holy Trinity. Until the time of these Councils the conflicting Decrees of Provincial Synods could not have any firm authority, nor were all doubts dispelled even from the minds of those who were most faithful in keeping the Apostolical tradition.

It will now be easily understood that it is impossible to build on the facts of the controversy between St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen, any argument whatever against Papal Infallibility. Nevertheless, the question was sure to find a place in the work recently published under the name of "Janus,"[309] in which all the rubbish of the old Gallican and Jansenistic Schools has been diligently collected. The authors show clearly that they have not at all understood the controversy on heretical baptism, or that they have purposely disguised it. "Janus" says that "the dispute had a clearly dogmatic character;" that "the opposition of Pope Stephen to the doctrine confirmed at several African and Asiatic Synods against the validity of schismatical baptism, remained wholly inoperative;" that "St. Cyprian and Firmilian denied his having any right to dictate a doctrine to other Bishops and Churches;" that "later on St. Augustine maintains that the pronouncement of Stephen, categorical as it was, was no decision of the

[309] *The Pope and the Council*, ch. iii., sec. 4, pp. 66, 67. By "Janus." Translated from the German. London, 1869.

Church, and that St. Cyprian and the Africans were therefore justified in rejecting it;" and that, according to the holy Doctor, "the real obligation of conforming to a common practice originated with the Decree of a great Council." These assertions, which are in perfect agreement with the opinions of Mgr. Maret and of the old Gallican School, are partly false and partly calumnious. They have already been repeatedly refuted by numerous theologians, and what we have already said in this section is itself sufficient refutation; we will add here only a word on St. Augustine. What the author attributes to St. Augustine does not exist in his works; it is not found in the place quoted by the writer,[310] nor in any other place; it is, in short, a mere calumny against the holy Doctor. St. Augustine does not say more on the subject than we quoted above. Orsi, therefore, and the advocates of Papal Infallibility, have no reason to give up the African Doctor, as "Janus" tells us that they do. Orsi never did rebuke him either formally or materially, except in the fancy of "Janus," nor is it more true that Bellarmine thought that he had perhaps spoken a falsehood.[311] In a few lines we have

[310] The reference as given in the note to p. 67, is *De Baptismo*, t. ix., pp. 98—111 (Op. Edit. Bened.). What an easy manner of quoting the Fathers! Does "Janus" believe that St. Augustine devotes the whole extent of thirteen pages in folio to explain the supposed assertion? What the holy Doctor says in the matter is exactly what we have stated above, which is to be found in his work *De Baptismo*, l. i., cap. vii., n. 9, p. 57.

[311] The writers quote Bellarmine erroneously. In the place cited (*De Eccl.*, i., 4) there is nothing which can refer to St. Augustine. Bellarmine speaks of St. Augustine in connection with St. Cyprian in *De Romano Pontifice*, l. iv., cap. vii. But neither there, or in any other place of his works, has he ever said that St. Augustine *perhaps spoke a falsehood!* As to Orsi, our author does not mention any place of his works in particular; but we can confidently assert that nowhere has he rebuked St. Augustine. This is but one specimen of the erudition and honesty of "Janus."

a good specimen of the erudition and honesty of writers who, while professing to be Catholics, undertake a scandalous attack against the Church and its Head. But before concluding this section, let us add some other remarks on what "Janus" says concerning the authority of the Pope during the first three centuries. It seems that "Janus" knows very little, not only of Scripture, but also of that very historical science of which he seems to think himself a great master. He tells his readers that for thirteen centuries an incomprehensible silence reigned throughout the whole Church about that extensive authority of the Pope, and still less was any hint given that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him.[312] Whoever has carefully read what we have written in the previous volume of this work will be able to judge of the historical correctness of this assertion. Moreover, the learned writers complain that, during the first four centuries, not a single dogmatic Decree can be found issued by a Pope, nor a trace of the existence of any such document.[313] It is true that no Decree exists of that kind preserved in its integrity. But how can they prove that there is no trace of the existence of any? Have we not already mentioned several Decrees issued by the Popes against heretical leaders and sects? If the records of history had preserved for us more documents, we should know how the Roman Apostolic See condemned the heresies of that ancient age, and strengthened the faith of Catholics. The few which still remain tell us sufficiently that the Popes were from the beginning constant in their task of the guardians of faith, and, consequently, to them in justice it belonged to pronounce dogmatic decisions against all heretics, and to point out and declare the faith of the Catholic

[312] *The Pope and the Council*, l. c., p. 64.
[313] *Ibid.*, l. c.

Church. We have said enough on this subject, and the following sections will confirm our assertion to demonstration. We have already spoken of the case of Dionysius of Alexandria, which is alone sufficient for our purpose, nor does the importance of this case in any way depend, as "Janus" would have it do, upon the question whether or not the act of the Pope was known beyond the limits of Alexandria. The fact is that even at that age extraordinary wisdom and authority were exhibited by the Apostolical See in defending and explaining the dogmas of faith, and in fixing the forms of words by which they were to be expressed. We will invite our readers to peruse the remarks of the learned Hagemann on this subject.[314] He openly complains that even Catholics often appeal to the Greek writers, and spare no praise in favour of their subtlety in controversy, while the Popes since the beginning always manifested incomparable wisdom in exploding and condemning errors and heresies, and in explaining Catholic truths.[315] But even if no dogmatic Decree of faith had been put forth by the Popes in the first three centuries of the Church, it would not follow that they had not authority to exercise this power had they thought it necessary. Here, as often, our adversaries confound the exercise of power with the right. In addition to this want of logic, they prove themselves wanting in the elements of theological doctrine. Because, if in the fourth or fifth century we see the Popes in full exercise of that supreme prerogative in causes of faith, without any protest on the part of the Episcopal body, we must conclude that those prerogatives which are clearly seen in the Papal Acts of the fourth or fifth century, must have been an inheritance transmitted to

[314] *Die Römische Kirche*, ii., 4, p. 117; ii., 6, p. 131. Freiburg, 1864.

[315] *Ibid.*, ii., 6, p. 129.

the Popes from Christ our Lord, through St. Peter's ministry: for the Universal Church cannot remain in error for so many centuries in a matter which is vital in itself and forms an essential part of the constitution of the Church. Thus the argument recently urged by Dr. Frohschammer against the work of "Janus" is fully justified.

SECTION VII.

GENERAL COUNCILS AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

IN the work of Monseigneur Maret against Papal Infallibility we find two principal errors which form the basis of the whole structure. These are a false statement of fact and a false deduction in logic. The author begins by adulterating the doctrine on the constitution of the Church as explained by the champions of Papal Infallibility. Drawing a line of demarcation between what he wrongly calls the Italian School of Bellarmine and the School of Paris and Bossuet,[316] he says that the theologians of the first "conviennent que les évêques peuvent participer au gouvernement général de l'Eglise dans la mesure que le Pape détermine." But he adds that, "malgré ces aveux et ces concessions, il n'en est pas moins évident que, dans le systéme de cette école, le Pape posséde la monarchie pure, indivisible, absolue, illimitée."[317] Accordingly he strives to represent the

[316] The School which Mgr. Maret calls Italian, but which is really the Roman, or Catholic School, embraced within its pale even the French theologians of the Sorbonne. M. Gérin has clearly demonstrated this in his excellent work *L'Assemblée du Clergé de France de* 1682, ch. viii., p. 333, seq.; App. A, B, p. 481, seq., p. 522, seq. We will return to this subject in another section of the present book.

[317] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. i., t. i., p. 130.

Pope in that system as isolated from the Episcopal body and from the Church,[318] and his government as a "gouvernement de l'arbitraire et du bon plaisir."[319] On the contrary, in the Gallican School the Bishops "ne sont pas seulement les conseillers du Pape, ils sont juges et législateurs avec lui; et par leur union avec leur chef, forment la souveraineté ecclésiastique," which he considers "essentiellement complexe et composée de l'élément monarchique et de l'élément aristocratique."[320] The French Prelate manifestly intends to convey the idea that the so-called *Ultramontane* School separate the Pope from the Bishops, and reduce the latter to the state of Princes who have the honour to serve an absolute, irresponsible, and arbitrary monarch, the Pope, who rules over the Church by his own caprice.[321] His language might lead to the impression that theologians of that School divest the Bishops of any right to exercise their prerogatives as judges of faith in Ecumenical Councils; that they admit the Pope as the one universal judge in the Church, either dispersed, or assembled in General Synods. This is the Bishop's error in *fact*. As to the other error in *logic*, Mgr. Maret appears to think that because the Bishops assembled in Ecumenical Councils have always acted as judges of faith, therefore the Roman Pontiff cannot be infallible in his solemn dogmatical judgments. In

[318] Op. cit., l. iv., ch. vi., t. ii., p. 125.

[319] Op. cit., l. iv., ch. x., t. ii., p. 190.

[320] Op. cit., l. ii., ch. i., t. i., p. 131.

[321] The same view is held by "Janus." "On this view," he says, "the power of the Pope over the Church is purely monarchical, and neither knows, nor tolerates, any limits. He is to be the sole and absolute master; all beside him are his plenipotentiaries and servants, and are, in fact, whether mediately or immediately, the mere executors of his orders, whose powers he can restrict at his pleasure" (*The Pope and the Council*, ch. iii., pp. 40, 41).

pursuance of this idea he employs nearly the whole first volume in proving that in all the twenty-two General Councils held in the Church, from that of Nicæa to that of Trent, the Bishops constantly performed the office of judges of faith, and having established this, he thinks that he has solidly proved "la complexité des éléments (Monarchie et Aristocratie Episcopales) qui composent la souveraineté spirituelle et l'infaillibilité dogmatique, et la nécéssité du concours de ces deux éléments pour établir la règle absolue de la foi."[322]

Now, is it true that the theologians who dissent from the Gallican School have adopted such a system of isolation concerning the Pope, and have they built on it the doctrine of a dictatorial, irresponsible, and arbitrary personal Infallibility of the Pope? We are glad to see that Fr. Matignon, S.J., in a very valuable review of Mgr. Maret's work in the *Etudes*,[323] has already pointed out that the writer has given an entirely false view of the Roman Catholic doctrine on the constitution of the Church and on Papal Infallibility. For our own part, we cannot understand how Mgr. Maret could misunderstand a doctrine which is so clearly stated by the defenders of Papal Infallibility. We know that all Catholics entirely reject the idea of the isolation of the Supreme Pastor of the Church. We maintain with St. Cyprian,[324] and all the Fathers, that the Bishops are as the circumference of a circle, so that in order to have perfect unity in the Church they must cleave to each other so far as to keep the pale of Christ's Church entirely closed against schismatics and heretics. Moreover, we maintain that the Bishops must cleave to the centre of the circle, so that they may be

[322] *Du Concile Général*, Preface, p. xxvi.

[323] *Etudes Relig., Hist., et Littér.*, Oct., 1869, t. iv., n. 22, p. 619, seq.

[324] *Epist.* lxix., pp. 123, 124 (Edit. Baluz.); *Epist.* lv., p. 86.

gathered into a perfect unity; and finally, that the Chair of St. Peter, and consequently the Pope, is the centre, and the source of Episcopal unity.[325] In this view it is impossible to say that the circle is the centre alone, or that a centre of a circle could exist without any circumference. We cannot say that a human body is the head alone detached from the rest, or that there could be a human head separated from a body acting in its normal manner. In like manner we cannot say that the Church without Bishops is the whole Church, or that the Pope might act as Pope in a state of isolation from the Episcopal body. In this we fully adopt in principle the doctrine on Church unity stated by Bossuet and his School,[326] since it is in accord with Scripture and tradition. The Pope is the essential condition of unity in the Universal Church, as the Bishop in his diocese, for he is really the source of unity, and of life in the whole. But as the Bishops, and through them their flocks, must be united to the Pope in order to share in the unity and the life of the Universal Church, so the Pope must be closely united to the whole Church through the body of the Bishops in order to be the source of unity and of life of the whole. He could not possess this prerogative without the communication of the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of Christ. But the Holy Ghost communicates the sap of unity and life to the Head of the Church in order that it may be infused and distributed throughout the whole mystical Body of Christ, the Church itself. And thus it is that all theologians agree in saying that if—what is impossible—a Pope should manifestly and obstinately profess heretical doctrines, he would imme-

[325] See *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. i., p. 21.

[326] Bossuet, *Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique*, ch. xxi. (Ouvrages, t. iv., p. 400. Paris, 1862). Extracts will be found in *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 15.

diately cease to be Pope.[327] He could no longer be the source of Episcopal unity and of life in the Church, for he himself would be out of the unity and life of the mystical Body of Christ, which essentially springs from faith. But Christ our Lord has promised that His Church in its whole shall never perish, that He will dwell with it for ever, and therefore it is impossible that a formal separation should take place between the Head and the Episcopal body. Now a formal separation may be brought about either by a formal schism, or by a doctrinal disagreement between the Bishops and the Roman Pontiff; the former would destroy the unity of government in the Church, the latter the unity of faith, and both these unities are essential to the very existence of the Church. For if the Church be indefectible, it must be indefectible in unity of government as well as in unity of faith. In no case, then, can we conceive the Pope in a state of formal isolation from the Episcopal body, and the supporters of Papal Infallibility have good reason for their entire rejection of this erroneous doctrine.

Hence, too, it is easy to understand that, having regard to the constitution established in the Church by Christ, the Church cannot be considered as a mere and absolute monarchy, without any admixture of the aristocratical element in the Episcopacy. Widely as Roman Catholic theologians differ from the Gallican School on other points, on this they have never disagreed, but all have held to the doctrine which flows from established principles. Bellarmine is right in asserting that all the Catholic Doctors agree in this matter.[328] But what is the province of the Episcopal element in the monarchy of the Church? It is certain, not only that the Episcopal body can never be super-

[327] See Suarez, *De Fide*, disp. x., sec. vi., nn. 6—11.

[328] *De Rom. Pontifice*, l. i., cap. v.

seded in the Church by the Pope, but also that it can never be deprived of its inherent jurisdiction in the general government of the Church, although there is no difficulty as to restrictions and limitations being placed by the Pope upon the exercise of this jurisdiction, should necessity require such a course. Moreover, the Bishops, either in their own dioceses or in the Ecumenical Councils, are the natural judges of questions concerning faith, although under the guidance and subject to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff.[329] Within these limits the government of the Church is monarchical and aristocratic at the same time. But the power given to the aristocratic Episcopal body was not intended by Christ to control or to reform the government and the teaching of the supreme ruler of the Church, but to give efficacy to his action on the whole body, to diffuse to every part the streams of divine life, and to draw tighter the bonds of unity which link together the whole structure. Should the aristocratic part of the Church be authorised to control the government and the teaching of the supreme ruler, he would cease to be the foundation of the whole building, the shepherd of the whole flock, the support of all his brethren. The supreme authority would devolve on the Episcopal body, and the monarchy established by Christ would be converted into a mere oligarchy. Christ did not take the idea of His Church from any of the Constitutional Governments of our own age, nor did He please to establish it in an absolute form; and therefore it was necessary that the privilege of infallibility should be conferred upon the head and chief of all, to save the Church from absolute subjection to one who should rule as supreme, and as subject to no control or check of any kind. The

[329] See Muzzarelli, *De Auctoritate R. Pontificis in Conciliis*, t. ii., cap. x., sec. v., p. 212, seq. Gandavi.

Gallicans, and, among others, Mgr. Maret, employ a wrong method in arguing on this subject. They look with fear upon any government which is arbitrary and exempt from all control; therefore they deprive the Pope of his infallibility, because they think that a prerogative of this kind would turn Papal government into a dictatorship likely to be swayed by caprice. But they do not see that Christ granted to the Pope this prerogative in order that his supreme *magisterium* in the Church might not be converted into a tyranny over the minds of men. If the Pope is infallible in his supreme and authentic *magisterium*, his utterances are utterances of the whole Church; they are the expression of divine truth, they are the word of Christ, Who lives with the Church; consequently, submission to the decisions of the Pope is a submission to eternal truth; it is a submission to God. And no tyranny or caprice can have place when God speaks; human reason rightly submits to His voice.

Mgr. Maret, like his predecessors in the Gallican School, finds difficulty in understanding Papal Infallibility in a state of isolation from the Church. But these writers do not see that they put an entirely false appearance upon the Roman Catholic doctrine of Papal Infallibility. We wonder that Mgr. Maret has thought it worth his while to put forward again an old difficulty, which has been so often answered by supporters of Papal Infallibility, and especially by Muzzarelli, whose work the French Prelate undertook to refute.[330] Muzzarelli had expressly noticed the equivocation used by the older Gallicans when they expressed the Roman Catholic doctrine on Papal Infallibility by the formula that "the Pope alone is infallible in judging causes of faith and morals." Muzzarelli remarks that this proposition must not be understood as implying the total

[330] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. i., t. i., p. 145.

exclusion of the Episcopal body in agreement with the Pope; unless we are dealing with the chimerical hypothesis of a Pope alone standing on one side, and the Episcopal body on the other, struggling one against the other.[331] According to the principles stated above, Papal Infallibility does not exclude the Episcopal body in agreement with the Pope's definitions. And observe, according to Catholic principles, no definition of faith can exist unless grounded on Apostolic tradition and on the consent of the Churches. This is the reason why no theological doctrine can be defined as an object of faith, until proof is given either directly or indirectly that the doctrine is derived by tradition from the Apostles: directly, when it can be distinctly demonstrated that the doctrine has always been held in the Church, and handed down from the beginning by the succession of Bishops; indirectly, when it can be proved that in any of the past ages, or in our own, it was, or is, held as a doctrine of faith by the greatest part of the teaching body in the Church. In that case its Apostolical origin is deduced indirectly; for without this origin no doctrine can be held as of faith by the body of the Church. This being so, Papal definitions on matters of faith must rest on the solid foundation of primitive tradition; and therefore the Pope is bound to inquire and to examine the whole matter before pronouncing a final definition. The infallibility of the Church, and also that of the Pope, are the effect of divine *assistance*, not of a supernatural *inspiration*, much less of revelation; and this consideration lets us see the origin of the Provincial Councils which it was the old custom to assemble at Rome as often as the Pope was about to issue a dogmatic definition; and it also explains the Consistories of Cardinals which are held for the same purpose. Hence too come the Congregations

[331] *De Auctoritate Rom. Pontif.*, Proem., p. xcvii.

instituted for the careful examination of controversies which have been referred to Rome for decision; the consultations of the best theologians of the Church; the commission given to the Bishops to inquire in their own dioceses into the matter in question, and to report to Rome the results of their researches. No Pope, before deciding a doctrinal question, has ever dispensed with these investigations, which are calculated to verify the true tradition of the Church and to ensure that the doctrine to be defined has really Apostolic origin. And no Pope will dispense with the necessary inquiry on the subject; for in the prerogative of infallibility is implied the fulfilment of all the conditions which are necessary for its exercise.

When, then, the Pope solemnly pronounces a definition of faith, he acts in accordance with the whole Episcopal body, since he acts in accordance with the traditional teaching, first, of the Roman Church, and, secondly, of the other Churches, in which, more or less distinctly, the Apostolic tradition was preserved. He cannot possibly act against the tradition of the Church, because this impossibility of error is one of the conditions essentially found in the prerogative of infallibility. But at the same time it is he who pronounces the final decision and utters the formal definition concerning the belief of the Church. The consent of the Episcopal body to the Papal pronouncement must necessarily follow as an evident mark of the fulfilment of God's promises made to His Church. For Apostolical tradition cannot be adulterated in its transmission and propagation; and consequently the body of the Bishops cannot fail to agree with a definition which expresses the Apostolical doctrine. Moreover, a separation of the Episcopal body from their Supreme Head would be a death-blow to the whole Church, and would overthrow the promises of indefectibility and infallibility made by

Christ to His Church. We must then conclude that the Pope judging *ex cathedrâ* is not in a state of isolation from the Episcopal body; but, on the contrary, he is in the most perfect union with them: and their unity is in itself an evident proof of the divine assistance given to the Church.

Sometimes it is true that *reclamantes* may be found in the Episcopal body, just as the Apostolic College had its Judas, and as Nestorius and Dioscorus were reckoned among the Bishops of the fifth century, and Sergius among those of the seventh. But this does not imply any breach of unity in the Church, or that a disagreement had sprung up between the Episcopal body and the Pope. It implies only that in the field of the Lord there must be the tares mixed with the wheat. From what we have said it is easy to conclude that Mgr. Maret does not understand the doctrine which he has endeavoured to refute. In fact, commenting on the famous passage of St. Irenæus, which we quoted in the third section, he says: "L'évêque de Lyon, affirme t-il que cet évêque de Rome, ce prince de l'Eglise universelle, est un monarque absolu? Affirme t-il, dans aucune circumstance et pour terminer de funestes controverses, il ne sera jamais nécessaire de consulter cette tradition de l'Eglise universelle, où il place lui-même la vérité? Enseigne t-il qu'il sera jamais nécessaire de comparer cette tradition avec celle de l'Eglise Romaine et avec les enseignements de ses Pontifes?"[332] Now, we should like to be told who ever asserted that the Pope is an absolute monarch in the Church, or that he is at liberty not to inquire into the universal Apostolic tradition before pronouncing his final definitions? That such a system of Papal dictatorship is brought into the Church by the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, is nothing but a dream of Mgr. Maret. But

[332] *Du Concile Général*, l. iv., ch. vi., t. ii., p. 111.

the Bishop of Sura cannot understand how a General Council can have any existence if the Pope is infallible in his dogmatic utterances. "Si l'infaillibilité absolue," he says, "et separée du Pape est admise, elle ôte au Concile Général sa principale, sa vraie raison d'être. Il devient inutile et il pourrait être nuisible."[333] But was not Peter infallible? were not the other Apostles infallible? and yet they assembled a Council at Jerusalem in order to legislate on the controversy of the *legalia.* Mgr. Maret replies that "les Apôtres, sachant que leur privilége personel d'inspiration et d'infaillibilité ne pouvait passer à leurs successeurs ont voulu donner aux siècles futurs, dans le Concile de Jérusalem la forme la plus parfaite du gouvernement ecclésiastique."[334] We might with equal justice say that the Apostles, knowing that the Successors of Peter would preserve the privilege of infallibility, assembled a Council in order to show that notwithstanding Papal Infallibility, General Councils ought to be assembled. The fact is that the lesson given by the Apostles to their successors by the Council of Jerusalem was two-fold. First, that Papal Infallibility would not render General Councils useless. Secondly, that in extraordinary cases, when either new heresies had arisen, or great interests of the Church were at stake, the Popes, though possessing the prerogatives of infallibility, ought to assemble Ecumenical Councils. But it is quite false and erroneous to say that the Apostles "ont voulu donner aux siècles futurs, dans le Concile de Jérusalem la forme la plus parfaite du gouvernement ecclésiastique." For if the perfect form of ecclesiastical government was that of the Council, we must conclude that during all the Apostolical age, and the first three centuries of the Church, there was no perfect government, for during all this time

[333] Op. cit., l. iv., ch. xii., t. ii., p. 233.
[334] *Ibid.*, p. 234, seq.

certainly no Ecumenical Council was held; much less was such an assembly convened every ten years, according to the proposal of Mgr. Maret. Before the rise of the Arian heresy, which shook the very foundation of Christian belief, no one had thought of the necessity of calling an Ecumenical Synod; nor was the slightest idea entertained that the government of the Church was imperfect, because the Church was not ruled by General Councils, and because the Pope was not, like a constitutional King, presenting Bills to the Parliament, whose assent must be obtained before they can have validity in the kingdom. The Fathers constantly declared that the Church was built on the solid rock of Peter; they appealed to the Successor of St. Peter in their controversies of faith, and not to any General Council; they expected from the Apostolical See the final decision against which there was no appeal, or, like St. Jerome, they addressed the Pope in explicit terms, "Decernite, obsecro, si placet, et non timebo dicere tres hypostases."[335]

But notwithstanding this, it is true that the practical lesson left us by the Apostles was not neglected, and in great needs of the Church the Popes were accustomed to call a General Council. The necessity of this course has been pointed out by some of the chief champions of Papal Infallibility.[336] They remark that the solemn declaration of the Apostolic faith made by the assembled Bishops, as often as it is possible to hold such an assembly, will have great authority in crushing all lovers of novelty and error. Again, when the Church is in great need, or when ecclesiastical discipline requires

[335] See sec. iii., p. 56.

[336] See Muzzarelli, Op. cit., t. i., Proem., p. xcix. He says that this is a common doctrine among theologians — "Consentiunt omnes teneri Summum Pontificem Œcumenica concilia congregare, præsertim contra novos errores," etc.

a radical reformation, it is very desirable to call upon the wisdom, prudence, and experience of the whole body of Bishops, that the Church may receive suitable relief, and that discipline may be restored with prudence and vigour. But this is in no way opposed to Papal Infallibility. In the first case, the consent of the Episcopal body, manifested in such a solemn and imposing manner, is a new additional proof set before the enemies of faith, demonstrating the Infallibility of the Head of the Church, and of the body, which can never dissent from its infallible Head. Thus, says St. Leo, the Bishops, by agreeing with the supreme definition of the Pope, show themselves manifestly to be members of that Head.[337] In the other case, the Infallibility of the Pope is in no way compromised either when the Pope assembles a General Council, in order to inquire into the traditional teaching of the Church, or in order to avail himself of the prudence and wisdom of so respectable a body for the purpose of improving ecclesiastical discipline.

But the difficulty of the old and recent Gallicans in France, in Germany, and in England, lies just here. How can the Bishops in a General Synod keep their conciliar rights, and act as judges of the faith, if the Pope has the prerogative of infallibility? This is the Achilles of the arguments employed by Mgr. Maret throughout the first volume of his work, and he thinks that he has demolished the doctrine of Papal Infallibility by proving that the Bishops have always exercised judicial authority in the Ecumenical Councils. And when summing up the matter, he concludes triumphantly: "Point de milieu; ou il faut retirer aux évêques leur droit de *vrais juges* dans les Conciles Généraux, ou il faut refuser au Pape le pouvoir de leur imposer ses

[337] *Epist.* cxx. *ad Theodoretum*, cap. i., p. 1219 (Op., t. i. Edit. Ball.). "In hoc quoque capiti membra concordent."

décisions. Mais en prenant le premier parti, on méconnait la tradition constante de tous les Conciles Généraux, on est forcé de nier, ou de dénaturer des faits incontestables, de fouler aux pieds des droits vingt fois séculaires, et on donne à ses propres principes un démenti éclatant."[338] We certainly maintain, with all theologians, that the Bishops in General Synods are truly judges of faith, but we add that Papal Infallibility is in no way affected by this. In fact, the case may be considered in two aspects; either the Pope defines nothing in the contested matter before the Synod has pronounced its judgment, or he has published his definitive Decree before summoning the Bishops to the meeting. In the first case, it is easy to understand that the Bishops may freely exercise their right of judges discussing the proposed question, examining its traditional origin, and deciding after having gained full knowledge of the matter. In this case, even if the Pope should transmit to the Council his instructions, they will not interfere with the freedom of the Council, because they are not properly infallible utterances of the Apostolical See. Bellarmine himself, who is represented as the greatest champion of Papal Infallibility, holds exactly this doctrine.[339] Nevertheless, all agree in saying that the judgment of the Bishops in Synod must harmonise with the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, in order that their Decrees may be infallible.

The main question is whether the Bishops in Synod can truly be judges of the faith, and use perfect freedom in their discussions, when the Pope has previously defined the matter in question. Mgr. Maret and all the Gallican School believe that this is impossible. But they have conceived a wrong idea of the freedom and right of the Bishops in Council. First, I

[338] *Du Concile Général*, l. iv., ch. ix., t. ii., p. 161.
[339] *De Conciliis*, l. ii., cap. xi.

would ask whether the Bishops exercised their full rights in the deliberations of the Council of Trent? Mgr. Maret frankly asserts that they did.[340] Well, I ask, again, whether the dogmatical Decrees of the Council of Trent concerned free controversies, which were then for the first time to be decided by the assembled Bishops, and whether they were free to pronounce a decision contrary to that at which they actually arrived. Unquestionably, nearly all the dogmatical Decrees enacted by the Council of Trent were doctrines of faith long before that Synod had met. Nevertheless, the Fathers did not affix their signatures to the formal definitions until they had spent a long time in minute researches into the foundations of the doctrine. For instance, the doctrine of the Real Presence had been always held in the Church as a doctrine of faith, and yet the Fathers of Trent spared no kind of study and investigation in order to secure the solid foundation on which that doctrine was immoveably grounded. Their judgment on this, as well as on many other subjects, had no alternative whatever except between faith and heresy. Again, any one who is acquainted with the Acts of the Councils must know that often the Bishops when assembled in Synod, signed the dogmatical Decrees already sanctioned by the preceding Ecumenical Councils, and confirmed and published by the Roman Pontiff. Now it cannot be denied that they acted as judges of faith when signing these already infallible Canons. They acted as judges, but their judgment was really a dutiful submission to the doctrines of faith. In fact, the forms of expression used by them in their signatures make both these points manifest. The forms employed are the following—"Judicans, subscripsi: recognoscens consensi," etc.; and on the other hand—"Obtemperans sententiæ

[340] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. xiii., t. i., p. 501, seq.

sanctissimorum et beatissimorum Episcoporum . . . consentiens et ego subscripsi; Cognoscens discussionem Sanctorum Patrum, et cum sequi debeam eorum judicium, subscripsi," etc.[341] The Bishops are truly judges when they submit to the dogmatical Decrees of the preceding Councils; we must, then, conclude that they judge also when receiving the definition of faith at the hands of the Pope. Certainly, to pronounce a judgment does not necessarily imply that the judge must have the power of passing a sentence contrary to that of the supreme judge, but only that he must be thoroughly acquainted with the cause in question, and must have sufficient reason for forming his judgment upon it. Now, when the Pope has infallibly spoken in the matter, this is for the Bishops one of the strongest imaginable motives to judge in accord with the Pope's sentence and to submit to it. But their submission widely differs from the submission of the Faithful at large. The submission of the people is a simple act of obedience to the infallible authority of the Pope, but the submission of the Bishops is also a judicial act bearing on matters of faith, and their confirmation is authoritative and canonical. They have therefore the right to examine and discuss the cause in question, that they may gain full knowledge of its nature and purport. This manner of proceeding not only enables them to act as judges of faith, but also serves as a check to the complaints of heretics, who would blame the Church for embracing doctrines which were not the fruit of a careful investigation by the Popes and by the

[341] See Concilium Chalcedonense, Act. iv. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1462); Conc. Nic. ii., Act. vii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 1203, seq.); etc. In this, as well as in other General Synods, the Fathers sign the definitions of faith sanctioned by preceding Councils with the same formulæ with which they enact the new definitions.

Councils.[342] Muzzarelli himself, in stating this doctrine, which is common to all Catholic theologians, refers to a Gallican Synod held in 1699 in Rheims, in which a declaration is found exactly in accordance with what we have here asserted. The Fathers of Rheims maintained that "le consentement des Evêques au jugement du premier Siège est tout ensemble et un acte d'obéissance envers ce siège et un acte d'autorité et de jugement sous l'autorité principale de ce même Siège."[343] The principle which we have been advocating is exactly the same.

[342] See Muzzarelli, Op. cit., cap. x., sec. v., t. ii., p. 212, seq.
[343] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

SECTION VIII.

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA AND PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. THE CASE OF POPE LIBERIUS.

EVERY General Council is a clear and visible demonstration that the Church of Christ is One in its government and One in its doctrine; that it is divinely grounded on the solid rock of the Apostolical See; that the Roman Pontiff is the Vicar of Christ upon earth, the Supreme Head of all the Church, to whom all the Bishops with their flocks must adhere, in order to keep the most perfect unity of government and of faith. In the third section of this book we pointed out how deeply this maxim was rooted in the Catholic mind in antiquity, and how strongly all felt the necessity of being in union with the Papal teaching in order to deserve the character of orthodox. The same great and fundamental principle was realised and expressed in a still more sensible and solemn manner by those general assemblies of Bishops, which represented the Universal Church united with its Head. It is absurd to say, with some, that the constitution of the Church first received a manifest and substantial existence when the first Ecumenical Council met at Nicæa. The constitution of the Church from the beginning ever was, and to the end ever will be, one and the same. The Church is governed by the same principles, whether it be dispersed or gathered into a General Synod. The Catholic Bishops are summoned to assemble in Council as often as is necessary,

especially in case new heresies have arisen, in order to give open proof of their close and indissoluble connection with the Pontifical *magisterium;* not in order to control or direct it, nor in order to give a completely irreformable character to its decisions of faith. Mgr. Maret is quite mistaken on this point, no less than were Bossuet and the other Gallican writers. We intend to show in the present and following sections that all the Ecumenical Councils, from the first held at Nicæa downwards, though legally keeping their conciliar rights, were nevertheless so many sensible evidences of the divine economy of the Church, by which the Episcopal body, when representing the Church, will always be in perfect accord with the Papal *magisterium,* and always echo its definitions.

Although during the first three centuries the Gnostic and Antitrinitarian sects had made some attempt to overthrow Christianity, yet none of these met with the same success as attended the blasphemous teaching of Arius. The heresy of Sabellius, that of Paul of Samosata, and the spread of the Pagan philosophy, had prepared the path for Arianism. The doctrine of the unity of the Godhead in three Persons could not be understood by men who were confident that it could be explained by means of the imperfect principles of the Pagan philosophy. The idea of *personality,* inasmuch as it is distinguished from the conception of individual nature, had no meaning whatever in the philosophy of Pagan antiquity. Consequently, Sabellius, maintaining the abstract unity of the divine essence, believed that the distinction of divine Persons would necessarily lead to the doctrine of plurality of Gods. Therefore, he admitted no other distinction between them except that of three different names, by which the one and the same God had revealed Himself in the great works of Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification. Arius,

starting from the same principle, arrived at the opposite error. Following the steps of his master Lucian, and desirous of maintaining the personal distinction in God, he falsified the doctrine of the divine essence, and upset the Catholic conception of the Holy Trinity. He conceived the Son of God as being different in essence from the Father, as being a creature of the Father's hands, brought forth by His will before any other work of His creation; consequently he recognised an infinite distance between the Son and the Father, though he admitted that the former had been raised up to the sublime dignity of Son of God, and had been called God, like the Father. In this system the idea of the eternal generation of the Word of God is entirely rejected and condemned, and the divinity of the Logos is altogether denied.

The contest soon spread from Alexandria all over the Eastern Church, and the heresiarch was countenanced and defended by men of authority and learning, as by Eusebius of Cesarea and by his namesake of Nicomedia. The peace of the Church and the tranquillity of the Empire were alike at stake, and the contest becoming daily more embittered with popular passions, threatened Christian society with yet greater evils. On this account the Emperor Constantine was advised by the Bishops to have recourse to a General Council, which would appease the troubles of the Church and of the Empire.[344] Pope Sylvester was accordingly applied to, and with his authority no less than 300 Bishops, mostly from the East, assembled at Nicæa for the first Ecumenical Council.[345]

[344] Ruffinus, *Hist.*, l. i., cap. i., p. 467 (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xxi.). "Tum ille (Constantinus) ex Sacerdotum sententia apud urbem Nicæam Episcopale concilium convocat."

[345] In *Vita Sylvestri Papæ*, *Liber Pontif.* (Labbe, t. i., p. 1432); in Sermone Acclamatorio Synodi vi., Act. xviii. (Labbe, t. vii.,

Now the Gallicans believe that this Council, and the decision to which it came, afford an invincible proof against Papal Infallibility. Bossuet, in his *Defence of the Declaration of* 1682, maintains that the Decrees of Nicæa against the Arians received their authority only from the consent of the assembled Fathers, without any shade of Papal confirmation whether before or after the meeting of the Synod.[346] Mgr. Maret, in his recent work, does not venture to go quite so far. He admits the consent of the Pope to the Decrees of the Synod, but he draws the conclusion that their strength and authority depends upon the accord of the Bishops with the Roman Pontiff.[347] Mgr. Maret here speaks the truth, for no General Council could have the least authority in the Universal Church if its Canons were not sanctioned by the Apostolic See; therefore he implicity condemns the assertion of the Gallican School of Bossuet, which teaches that Synodical Canons of faith have virtue to bind independently of the sanction of the Roman Pontiff. But Mgr. Maret seems not to be aware that this doctrine as to the authority of Universal Councils, is admitted and professed by all the champions of Papal Infallibility. For we maintain, without a shadow of self-contradiction, both that the Pope, speaking *ex cathedrâ*, is infallible in his decisions, independently of any sanction of the Bishops, and that no less infallibility belongs to the Universal Synod,

p. 1086). Certainly all antiquity was persuaded that no General Synod could meet without the authorisation of the Apostolic See. In the Council of Chalcedon the Legates of the Pope accused Dioscorus, for that he had assembled a Synod without the consent of the Roman See, and they added—"Quod nunquam licuit, nunquam factum est" (Act. i. Labbe, t. iv., p. 866).

[346] *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xii., cap. vii., t. ii., p. 159, seq. Edit. Basileæ.

[347] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. ii., t. i., p. 147.

when enacting its Decrees of faith, in agreement with, and with the sanction of, the Roman Pontiff.[348]

As to the Council of Nicæa, its Decrees not only rested on the consent of the Apostolic See, but they were a public and a solemn act of adhesion to the infallible teaching of that See. The 300 Bishops did not sit in Council in order to decide what was to be the belief of the Faithful on the subject of the nature of the Divine Word, but for the purpose of giving a solemn testimony to the Apostolic teaching already put forth in a definite form by Pope Dionysius. In fact, St. Athanasius expressly affirms that the Arian heresy had been already condemned long before the Council of Nicæa, and that it had been condemned by Pope Dionysius, who pronounced his sentence in the Synod held in Rome for that purpose, when he was informed that his namesake Dionysius, Patriarch of Alexandria, had taught in his writings that the Word of God was a creature and a thing made by God (*ποίημα, κτίσμα*), not consubstantial with the Father (*ὁμοούσιος*). The Declaration of Pope Dionysius was really an infallible utterance; and this, being so, according to the custom of the time, he assembled a Synod in Rome before addressing his dogmatical Letter to the Patriarch of Alexandria. In his Letter he defined the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Divine Word with the Father, and sanctioned the use of the word *ὁμοούσιος*.[349] Therefore St. Athanasius rightly concludes that the Arian heresy had been long before anathematised by all.[350] By all; if so, the Arian doctrine must have been held as heretical in the Universal Church, and the

[348] See Muzzarelli, Op. cit., cap. v., sec. v., t. i., p. 100, seq.

[349] St. Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii*, n. 13 (Op., t. i., p. 198. Edit. Patavii); *De Synodis*, n. 43 (Op., t. ii., p. 605).

[350] *De Sententia Dionysii*, l. c. *ἀλλ' ἔκπαλαι παρὰ πάντων ἀναθεματισθεῖσα τῶν Χριστομάχων Ἀρειανῶν ἡ αἵρεσις.*

definition of Pope Dionysius must have been regarded as infallible. Nor does St. Athanasius give any reason, except the Pope's definition, for Arius having been expelled from communion and condemned by the Church in Alexandria.[351] The doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Word with the Father was considered as a doctrine of faith, and the contrary opinion as heretical. This is easily evidenced from the Synodical Letter addressed by the Alexandrine Patriarch Alexander to his brother of Constantinople. He plainly speaks in it of the doctrine of the consubstantiality as being strictly dogmatic, for which, as he declares, he and every orthodox Christian would lay down his life.[352] In accordance with this, the error of Arius is described as heresy both in this letter, written by the Alexandrine Patriarch alone, and in that addressed by him and the Synod of Alexandria to all Catholic Bishops.[353] And the formula of faith drawn up by this Synod, and directed against the same error, received the signatures of Pope Sylvester[354] and of the other Bishops.[355] Finally, the 300 Bishops who met at Nicæa, even before any discussion whatever, regarded the doctrine attacked by the Arians as an article of faith. When, at the very beginning of the Council, Arius proceeded to explain

[351] L. c.

[352] *Epist. Alexandri Patriarchæ Alex. ad Patriarcham Constantinop.* (In Labbe, t. ii., p. 23), vel penes Theodoretum, *Hist.*, l. i., cap. iii., p. 887, seq. (Op., t. iii. Edit. Migne). ταῦτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ ἀποστολικὰ δόγματα, ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ ἀποθνήσκομεν.

[353] *Dejectio Arii missa ab Alexandro Episcopo omnibus Episcopis.* In *Hist. Gelasii*, l. ii., cap. iii. (Labbe, t. ii., p. 150, seq.).

[354] *Epist.* ii. *Liberii Papæ ad Constantinum Imp.* (Labbe, t. ii., p. 801). In this Letter, Liberius mentions the epistle addressed by the Patriarch Alexander to Pope Sylvester, in which he informed the Pontiff of the condemnation of the heresiarch and of the faith defined.

[355] τῷ τόμῳ συνυπογραψάντων (Epist. cit., *Alexandri ad Episc. Constantinop.* Labbe, t. ii., p. 24).

to the assembled Fathers the doctrine held by him as to the nature of the Divine Word, all the Bishops stopped their ears, refusing to listen to his blasphemies; and they were unanimous in condemning the heresy, and in pronouncing anathema upon it.[356]

We must, then, conclude that the business of the Council of Nicæa was not to examine and judge of points and formulæ of doctrine which were not already dogmatic. Nevertheless, the Fathers were truly judges of faith. But their final decision was an act of submission to the universal doctrine of the Church, which had already been defined in the judgment pronounced by Pope Dionysius. They gave their decision in conformity with that of the Apostolic See, represented by the Papal Legates present in the Synod itself; and they thus gave proof that the Episcopal body is always found in agreement with the tenets and decisions of the Roman Pontiffs, as members connected with their Head: according to the promises instituted by Christ, and by virtue of His indwelling Spirit. And the same must be said of the other controversy of faith indirectly settled by the Nicæan Synod. The Decree of Stephen against rebaptism had already pointed out the universal Apostolical tradition and the doctrinal practice of the Roman Church; this was sufficient to induce the Fathers of Nicæa to proclaim the doctrine. Their decisions could not fail to be in perfect accord with the Apostolic tradition when they were in accord with the doctrine of the Roman Church, where this tradition had always been preserved in its integrity. Their Decree on the baptism of the Paulianists is, then, a new proof and confirmation of our position. Before leaving this branch of the argument, we notice that Mgr. Maret makes on this and other conciliar decisions

[356] See St. Athanasius, *Epist. ad Episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ*, n. 13 (Edit. Petavii, p. 223).

an observation which is frequently found in writers of the same School. He says that the controversy was settled only when a General Synod had pronounced its final sentence. He means to imply that Papal definitions, though they had some authority in the Church, were yet unable to settle any controversy of faith, because they were not regarded as infallible; but when a General Synod had judged, and its Decree had been sanctioned by the Pope, all was then settled, because that Decree was regarded as an infallible utterance.[357] But this view is a mistake, as will be clearly shown in the following sections. For the moment we will be content with two remarks. First, we have seen that, long before the Council of Nicæa, the doctrine of the *Homousios* had been held as dogmatic, and that the Arian faction were regarded as heretical. The controversy was then already settled for Catholics, especially when all the Bishops signed the dogmatical Decree enacted by the Synod of Alexandria. The Arians, like heretics in all ages, did not, of course, look upon the controversy as formally settled, because there is no heresy without an open rebellion against the living authority of the Church. The Council of Nicæa was called as a means to settle the controversy with them, when the mission of Hosius to Alexandria had failed to secure the intended effect. The decision of the Universal Church collected in Synod would have snatched every weapon from the hands of the Arians, depriving them of every support of authority in the Church, and unmasking their impudent rebellion. The Synod obtained its effect in some degree, but we cannot say that, after the Council of Nicæa, the Arian faction regarded the controversy on the nature of the Son of God as finally settled. It

[357] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. ii., n. iv., t. i., p. 151; ch. iii., n. ii., p. 166; ch. iv., n. iii., p. 180; etc.

continued its obstinate struggle for more than half a century, protected by the influence of imperial Constantinople; and when the generous efforts of the learned and zealous Doctors of the Church,[358] and the laws of the Catholic Emperor Theodosius,[359] had deprived the sect of its vitality in the civilised world, it continued to linger on among the barbarian Goths, Vandals, and Longobards, before its final disappearance. It is true that the standard of the Catholics, in their glorious struggle, was always the Decree and the Symbol of Nicæa; and this proves that a General Synod is a most effectual means to check and destroy heresy, but it does not prove that such an assembly is the exclusive means to settle any controversy of faith which may have arisen among Catholics.

Before leaving the age of the Arian controversy we must consider what is called the case or the fall of Pope Liberius, which has constantly been employed as a weapon against Papal Infallibility. The older Gallicans did not employ this weapon, because they were clear-sighted enough to understand that even if Liberius had signed any of the three formulas of Sirmium, his conduct would not the least effect the real question at issue. The reason of this is given by Bossuet himself, who, speaking of the fall of Pope Liberius, says that "ce fut par une violence manifeste, et tout acte qui est extorqué par le force ouverte est nul de droit et réclame contre lui."[360] Other writers, including Professors of the Sorbonne, assert

[358] The principal champions of the Faith in this struggle, were St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzum, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. J. Chrysostom, and St. Ambrose.

[359] *Codex Theodosianus*, l. xvi., tit. i., l. ii. (Edit. Gothofredi, t. vi., p. 5. Lipsiæ).

[360] *Instruct.* ii. *sur l'Eglise*, n. 105 (Op., t. v., p. 456. Paris, 863).

that the fall of Liberius was only personal, and that it has nothing to do with Papal definitions *ex cathedrâ*.[361] But more recent French writers have not imitated the wisdom of their predecessors, and Cardinal de la Luzerne, in his attempted refutation of Orsi's work against Bossuet, endeavours to represent Pope Liberius' signature as a definition *ex cathedrâ*.[362] And last year we have had Mr. Renouf maintaining that there is "very positive evidence that the Pope *officially* subscribed a heterodox creed."[363] Mgr. Maret does not seem to go the whole way with Cardinal de la Luzerne. But he asserts what he calls "l'hérésie privée" of Liberius, and he remarks that "il n'est pas nié même par ceux qui ne veulent pas reconnaître dans les lettres de ce Pontife un jugement solennel.[364] Mgr. Maret confounds two different things. It is true that for centuries many Catholic writers admitted that Pope Liberius had signed either the first or the third formula of Sirmium, while Blondel, with the Protestants and some Jansenists in France, maintained that he had put his hand to the second, which was truly heretical.[365] But, if we make exception of Cardinal de la Luzerne, and of some other blind lovers of the "loathsome

[361] See, for instance, Tournely, *De Ecclesia*, l. v., art. iii., t. ii., p. 186. Parisiis, 1739. "Si quis ergo in eo (Liberio) error fuerit, erit personalis, non Pontificis auctoritate et ex cathedra definitus."

[362] *Déclaration de l'Assemblée du Clergé de France*, pt. iii., ch. vi., n. ix., p. 184, seq. Paris, 1843.

[363] *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 41.

[364] *Du Concile Général*, l. iv., ch. v., p. 79.

[365] Baronius (*An.* 357, n. 39, seq., t. iii., p. 596. Venet., 1707), Tillemont (*Mémoires*, t. vi., pt. ii., art. lxix, p. 305), and Natalis Alexander (*Sæc.* iv., diss. xxxii., t. iv., p. 368, seq. Paris., 1699), &c., think that Liberius signed the first formula of Sirmium; but Pagi (*Crit. in Baronii Annales an.* 357, n. 12, t. i., p. 489. Antuerpiæ), Valois (*Ann. ad Sozom.*, l. iv., cap. xv., p. 125), Marchetti (*Critica dell' Ab. Fleury*, t. ii., cap. iii., a. ii., n. 88, p. 151, seq. Venezia, 1787), &c., believe that he signed the third.

carcase of Gallicanism," all Catholics who believe that Liberius signed any one of the formulæ of Sirmium, excuse him from all heresy, while they admit an act of weakness induced by the open violence and cruelty of the Arian faction.[366] Hence they have not believed that his case could create any difficulty against Papal Infallibility.

Nevertheless, since the beginning of the last century an attempt has been made to defend Pope Liberius from the accusation of having signed any Sirmian formula whatever. Dr. Corgne wrote a dissertation on the subject, which was praised and highly valued by Dr. Thierry, a Professor of the Sorbonne.[367] Cardinal Orsi,[368] Zaccaria,[369] and others, following in the footsteps of Corgne, strenuously defended the calumniated Pontiff. But among all the apologists of the Pope the first place is due to the Bollandist Stilting. This learned writer, in his famous *Commentarius critico-historicus* on Pope Liberius, has exhausted the subject, and opened the way for those who come after him to vindicate the Pope from the calumnies of his enemies.[370] Nevertheless, for the lapse of more than half a century his great work remained nearly unknown, even to those who were engaged in the endeavour to screen the character and the ministry of Pope Liberius;[371] and it is only recently that writers have been found who, employing the argu-

[366] See, for instance, Baronius, l. c., nn. 46, 47, p. 598, seq.

[367] See his words in Muzzarelli, *De Auctoritate Rom. Pontificis*, Appendix altera, t. i., p. 194.

[368] Orsi, *Storia universale della Chiesa*, l. xiv., n. lxxi., seq., t. vi., p. 156, seq. Roma.

[369] Zaccaria, *De Commentitio Liberii lapsu.* In t. i. *Diss.*, diss. vii., p. 282, seq. Fulginiæ, 1781.

[370] In *Acta SS.*, t. vi., Sept., p. 572, seq.

[371] Muzzarelli, Marchetti, and Cardinal Litta, although they defended Liberius, did not go so far as to deny absolutely the fall attributed to him.

ments and materials brought forward by Stilting, and thoroughly examining every point, have solidly established the perfect innocence of the Pontiff.[372] Of course we still find writers who speak of the "terrible and utter fall of Liberius," as if the fact was admitted on all hands; and with Anglicans who openly profess that they ignore all Catholic works, this is not surprising. Only two years ago an excellent dissertation on the fall of Liberius appeared in the *Revue des Questions Historiques.* If Mgr. Maret had read this essay, he would not have written on the subject in a tone which seems to imply a total ignorance of all that is advanced in defence of the accused Pope. We maintain distinctly that the alleged fall of Liberius is a mere calumny of the Arians, invented by them, and spread widely, as a support to their cause. Let us review briefly the facts that preceded the supposed fall.

In the years which followed the Council of Nicæa, St. Athanasius, the foremost among the Doctors who upheld the consubstantiality of the Divine Word, became the object of bitter persecution; and his cause was so closely identified in men's minds with the cause of the Catholic faith, that to abandon the great Patriarch of Alexandria was held equivalent to abandoning the faith of Nicæa; while to stand by Athanasius was to be the champion of orthodoxy. Thus Pope Julius I. may be said to have given solidity to the great work achieved at Nicæa by the measures which he took at Sardica in defence of St. Athanasius. But on the death of the Emperor Constantine, and the accession of his son Constantius, the Arian party again gathered

[372] In our age, the progress in historical and critical studies has been such that, generally speaking, all Catholic writers defend Pope Liberius and deny his fall. Nor has this view been taken only by Italians or Germans, but also by French writers, as Abbé Rohrbacher, Darras, Constant, &c.

courage and gave fresh annoyance to the Catholics. Constantius from the very beginning of his reign showed something of his tendencies, by the patronage which he extended to the semi-Arians; but the influence of his brother Constantine, who ruled the western portion of the Empire, for a while hindered him from going as far as he would have wished, and saved the Catholics of the East from much persecution. But on the death of Constantine, Constantius remained sole master of the whole Empire; the Arian faction at once became predominant, and its leaders felt confident that their triumph was secure. They set vigorously to work with their old weapons of calumny to compass the ruin of the great Athanasius; and they succeeded so far in working upon the mind of Constantine, that the ruin of the Catholic champion was resolved upon in the imperial council. In the year 353 a Synod of Bishops was assembled at Arles, and the imperial will was signified that Athanasius should be condemned. The tyrant was not disappointed. One Bishop alone in the Assembly had the courage to refuse concurrence in a sentence which all felt to be unjust. This was Paulinus of Arles; his constancy was punished by banishment, and he died in exile.[373] It was not without the deepest grief that Pope Liberius, who had recently succeeded to Julius, received the news of the decision come to at Arles. At his request the Emperor granted that the affair should be investigated anew by a fresh Council, and Milan was appointed for the place of meeting. But no shadow of freedom was left to this Assembly. Constantius himself laid before the Bishops the sentence which they were required to sign; and threats of exile and death were held out against all who should contu-

[373] St. Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum ad Monachos*, n. 31 (Op., t. i., p. 286). See Moehler, *Athanase Le Grand*, t. iii., l. v., p. 6. Paris, 1840.

maciously refuse compliance with their master's will. Capital sentence was in fact pronounced against Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli, and some other heroic defenders of Athanasius; and although their lives were spared, they were sent into banishment.[374]

Liberius cannot have been ignorant that a like fate was awaiting himself; but he was no way intimidated. He wrote a Letter full of paternal love and Apostolic courage to the Confessors who had suffered exile for the cause of the faith and of Athanasius;[375] but the threats of Constantius, and the rich presents of the eunuch Eusebius, drew from him nothing but expressions of contempt and of steadfast resistance.[376] Carried before the Emperor, he spoke to him with such courage and firmness in favour of Athanasius and of the Nicæan faith as to extort admiration even from his enemies.[377] Theodoret has preserved for us his admirable address to Constantius, which is an excellent example of that firm and dignified tone which the Vicar of Christ should always hold when dealing with powerful oppressors of the Church.[378] Nevertheless, the Pontiff was carried into exile to Beroea in Thrace, on account of his firm refusal to condemn Athanasius and to communicate with the Arian party (355).[379]

[374] St. Athanasius, Op. cit., n. 33, p. 287; Sozomen., *H. E.*, l. lv., cap. ix., p. 1130, seq.; Theodoret., *H. E.*, l. ii., cap. xii., p. 1030, seq. Edit. Migne.

[375] *Epistola* vi. *Papæ Liberii* (Labbe, t. ii., p. 805).

[376] See St. Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.*, nn. 35, 36, pp. 288, 289. The generous words addressed by Pope Liberius to the eunuch Eusebius are recorded by St. Athanasius in this place.

[377] See Theodoret, l. ii., cap. xiii., p. 1034, seq. Mr. Renouf's remark, that it is probably not more authentic than the speeches in Livy (p. 44 of *Cond. of Honorius*), rests on his personal authority, supported by no reason whatever.

[378] St. Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.*, nn. 39, 40, p. 290.

[379] *Ibid.*, l. c.

Liberius had been eighteen months in exile, exposed to the insolence and cruelty of the Arians, when it chanced that Constantius, in April, 357, paid a solemn visit to Rome. It was then that the people of the city loudly demanded that their beloved Pastor Liberius should be restored to them; for they refused to recognise the intruder Felix, whom the Arians of the imperial Court had thrust into the Chair of the exiled Pontiff. All the historians of the time seem to agree in this account, as Socrates,[380] Sozomen,[381] Theodoret,[382] Sulpicius Severus,[383] and Ruffinus.[384] Socrates expressly says that "Pope Liberius was recalled and reinstated in his See, for, the people of Rome having raised a sedition and expelled Felix from their Church, Constantius deemed it inexpedient to further provoke the popular fury." The reason then, according to Socrates, for which Constantius recalled Liberius was political. Theodoret, who is far superior in historical exactness to Socrates and Sozomen, mentions the petition presented to the Emperor by the noble ladies of Rome, begging Constantius to recall Liberius; and he remarks that they were successful, and that the request was granted by the Emperor. Sulpicius Severus agrees with the narrative of both these historians, for he says that Liberius was recalled from exile on account of seditions in Rome. Ruffinus is doubtful whether the Pope's return should be ascribed to the favour of the Roman people, or rather to his having surrendered to the will of the Emperor, and signed a formula of faith. Sozomen

[380] Socrates, *H. E.*, l. ii., cap. xxxvii., p. 322, seq. Edit. Migne.

[381] Sozomen., *H. E.*, l. iv., cap. xi., p. 1139, seq. Edit. Migne.

[382] Theodoretus, *H. E.*, l. ii., cap. xiv., p. 1039, seq. Edit. Migne.

[383] Sulpitius Severus, *Hist. Sacra.*, l. ii., cap. xxxix., p. 15 (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xx.).

[384] Ruffinus, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. i., capp. xxii., xxvii., pp. 495, 498 (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xxi.).

alone differs from the others as to the immediate cause of the return of Liberius from exile. He relates that when the Roman people loudly demanded Liberius, the Emperor replied that he would recall him if he would consent to be in accord with the Priests of his Court.[385] In conformity with this, he ordered Liberius to come to Sirmium, where he urged him to confess that the Son of God is not of the same substance with the Father. He goes on to say that afterwards a document was presented to the Pope for signature, in which were contained the decrees enacted at the Synod of Sirmium against Paul of Samosata and Photinus; that, moreover, a formulary of faith was drawn up at Antioch, from which it seemed that certain persons had, under the pretext of the term "consubstantial," attempted to establish a new heresy of their own. Sozomen further says that Liberius, with several African Bishops, signed the document, but that the Arian Bishops, on the other hand, put their signature on a formulary of faith drawn up by Liberius himself, in which excommunication is pronounced against all who should deny that the Son is like to the Father in substance and in all other respects. The historian then subjoins the reason why Liberius required the adoption of this formulary; because Eudoxius and his partisans had circulated a report that Liberius had renounced the term consubstantial, and also had admitted that the Son is dissimilar from the Father.[386]

Now let us suppose for a moment that the narrative of Sozomen is true, what would follow against the faith of that "great and holy Pope," as Liberius is termed by Theodoret? First, Liberius, unquestionably, would not have rejected the doctrine, nor the term *Homousios;* secondly, he would have expressly professed the consubstantiality of the Son of God to His Father, when

[385] Sozomen., *H. E.*, l. iv., cap. xi., p. 1139, seq. Edit. Migne.
[386] *Ibid.*, cap. xv., p. 1150, seq.

professing that the Divine Word is like to His Father in substance. Finally, the omission of the word *Humousios* in the formulary of Antioch, would concern merely the particular case, in which several persons were represented as if they had abused the word and attempted to give rise to a new heresy. Such an omission then in these circumstances would not in any way affect the decisions of Nicæa. It follows hence that a false colour has been put by La Luzerne and his followers upon the narrative of Sozomen. They appeal to his authority, but in so doing prove their own ignorance of the circumstances which he relates. Mr. Renouf has written a long note on the case of Liberius, in which he makes a point of setting forth at length the passages from St. Athanasius and St. Hilary; but he abstains from quoting the words of Sozomen, and merely refers to the beginning of the fifteenth chapter of book iv., where the historian says that "Constantius recalled Liberius from Beroea and urged him in the presence of the deputies of the Eastern Bishops . . . to confess that the Son is not of the same substance of the Father."[387] Mr. Renouf renders the original words by *forced him*;[388] and thus conveys the idea that Sozomen necessarily spoke of a *fait accompli*, that Liberius, in fact, confessed that "the Son is not of the same substance as the Father;" whereas that sense is more fairly conveyed by the translation which we have followed, *urged* or *pressed* him. Even admitting the narrative of Sozomen, Pope

[387] From a new translation from the Greek, published in London, 1848, p. 166. See Renouf, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 42.

[388] This remark had already been made by the writer of an article on the "Case of Liberius" in the *Dublin Review*, July, October, 1868, p. 446. Valesius translated the words by "cœpit compellere." The Greek words ἐβιάζετο αὐτὸν do not need more; and "the imperfect," as is remarked in the above-mentioned article, "would naturally suggest that the action was incomplete."

Liberius did not subscribe a heterodox creed, as is asserted by the Cardinal de la Luzerne and Mr. Renouf; far less, as we will prove more fully hereafter, did he adopt the *second* Sirmian formula. This second formula is openly Arian, and is thus clearly different from that of which Sozomen speaks; and for the same reason the words of St. Athanasius in the Arian History,[389] assuming them to be authentic, cannot refer to the second formula. No confidence can be placed in the assertion of Philostorgius, when he says that Liberius and Hosius wrote against the term consubstantial and against Athanasius;[390] for he was himself an Arian, and moreover is notoriously one of the least exact among the historians of his age: and in this very passage he has fallen into error, for he places the translation of Eudoxius to the see of Antioch at a period subsequent to the alleged fall of Liberius and the restoration of the Pontiff to Rome. As to the Sixth Fragment attributed to St. Hilary, proof will shortly be given that it is altogether spurious. The passage then of Sozomen furnishes no proof that Liberius signed any heretical formula; indeed the text before us itself affords an argument that the Pope did not reject the word *Homousios;* especially if we keep in view the doctrine which that word implies. This can be shown as follows. Sozomen expressly says that Ursacius, Germanius, and the other Eastern Bishops, approved of a confession of faith drawn up by Liberius, in which he declared that those who affirm that the Son is not like unto the Father in substance and in all other respects, are excommunicate;[391] and he goes on to give the reason

[389] *Hist. Arianorum*, n. 41 (Op., t. i., p. 742).

[390] *Hist. Eccl. Epitome*, l. iv., n. 3, p. 493. Edit. Valesii.

[391] The formula, κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον τῷ Πατρὶ εἶναι τὸν Υἱόν, is Catholic, as St. Hilary himself believed. See *Lib. de Synodis*, n. 76, p. 530. Edit. Migne.

why the Pope drew up that formula. It is that "Eudoxius and his partisans at Antioch, who favoured the heresy of Aëtius, circulated a report that Liberius had renounced the term consubstantial, and had admitted that the Son is dissimilar from the Father." This means that the intention of Liberius in requiring the signature of the Arians to the formula which he laid before them, was to disprove and rebut the charge against his orthodoxy made by the report which was in circulation.

We will now proceed to show that Liberius did not really sign any one of the Sirmian formulæ. There were three formulæ of faith drawn up at different times at Sirmium. The first was composed in the Synod held in that town in 351, when Photinus was condemned and deposed on account of his denial of the eternal generation of the Divine Word. The formula adopted on that occasion, and signed by Arians and Catholics alike, is perfectly orthodox.[392] For this we have the testimony of St. Hilary himself.[393] But the same cannot be said of the second.[394] This second formula was drawn up by the Arians, just after the Synod of Sirmium, in 351, and is unquestionably heterodox. But the Emperor, who favoured the semi-Arian party more than the Arians, ordered it to be suppressed, and that all copies should be sought for and destroyed; he even threatened with punishment any who should be convicted of concealing the document.[395] A third formula was composed at Ancyra against the heresy of Aëtius, usually denominated the Anomean, which

[392] See it in Socrates, l. ii., cap. xxix., p. 124; and in St. Hilary, *De Synodis*, n. 38, seq., p. 509, seq.

[393] *De Synodis*, l. c.

[394] See this formula in Socrates, l. ii., cap. xxx., p. 127, seq.; St. Hilary, *De Synodis*, n. 11, seq., p. 487, seq.

[395] Socrates, l. c., p. 129; Sozomenus, l. iv.. cap. vi., p. 136.

through the influence of Eusebius had become predominant in the Patriarchate of Antioch. That sect followed an extreme form of Arianism, absolutely denying any likeness whatever of the Divine Word to the Father, and renewing in its worst features the whole heresy of Arius.[396] Basil, the semi-Arian Bishop of Ancyra, was enabled to assemble a Synod,[397] in which the Anomean heresy was condemned, and a new formula of faith composed, where profession was made that the Word was God of God, like to the Father Who begat Him, according to the Scriptures, and in all things like the Father.[398] This formula was brought to Sirmium, and was approved by an Assembly of Bishops, with the sanction of the Emperor Constantius, who wrote to the Church of Antioch a strongly-worded letter against Eudoxius and in favour of the doctrine contained in the new formula of faith.[399] This formula could not fairly be condemned as heterodox, for St. Athanasius himself justified it in his work *De Synodis.*[400] Now of these three formulæ of faith, it is evident that Pope Liberius could not have signed the first, because it was drawn up in the Synod of 351, when he was not Pope, and moreover it concerned the particular errors of Photinus, and had very little connection with the general position of the semi-Arians. It is not found mentioned in 357 by the Arian party as a standard of their belief; nor had it been rejected by their adversaries, for it was regarded as a Catholic formulary. That formula, indeed, could not satisfy the Arians, nor fulfil the designs of Constantius. We must then, for all these reasons put

[396] Petavius, *De Trinitate*, l. i., cap. x., n. ii.

[397] Sozomenus, l. iv., capp. xiii., xiv., p. 147, seq.

[398] See this formula in St. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, n. 8 (Op., t. ii., p. 576, seq.); Socrates, l. ii., cap. xxxvii., p. 136, seq.

[399] Sozomenus, l. iv., cap. xiv., p. 148, seq.

[400] *De Synodis*, n. 41 (Op., t. ii., p. 765).

together, absolutely deny that Liberius signed the first formula of Sirmium. As to the Arian creed which is termed the second of Sirmium, Blondel, with other Protestants, and Mr. Renouf, undertake the task of proving that it was signed by Liberius. But this opinion is nothing short of a paradox. Supposing Liberius to have signed this second formula, an open contradiction would exist between the passage of Sozomen upon the subject and the two fragments of St. Hilary relating to the same matter. Nor is it credible that Constantius would have required the signature of Liberius to a formula which that Emperor had already condemned, and all copies of which he had ordered to be destroyed, denouncing the severest punishments against all who should retain copies in their possession. We are confident that no answer can be given to these difficulties by those who still advocate this strange opinion.

It remains to demonstrate that Liberius did not sign even the third formula of Sirmium. First, we remark that those who maintain the affirmative are obliged to defend their assertion upon the authority of Sozomen alone, against the testimony of all those writers of the fourth and fifth centuries who mention the fall of Liberius, and against the tenour of the supposed Letters of Liberius himself. St. Athanasius alone is to be excepted; and he speaks in a general and indefinite manner, saying that Liberius was induced to subscribe.[491] For, as we proved above, Sozomen not only does not afford the slightest ground for the belief that Liberius condemned St. Athanasius, but this historian plainly informs us that the Pope signed a formula which contained nothing against the faith of Nicæa; and, moreover, according to the same narrative, he ordered his adversaries themselves to sign another formula, calculated to silence the report spread by the

[491] *Hist. Arianorum*, n. 41 (Op., t. ii., p. 291).

Arians, that he had rejected the term *Homöousios*, with the dogma which it implied. On the contrary, St. Hilary and Philostorgius assert that Liberius condemned St. Athanasius;[402] again, St. Hilary, St. Jerome, and the Martyrology of Ado, say that he consented to the Arian perfidy and pravity;[403] and on this account St. Hilary anathematises him over and over again.[404] The supposed Letters of Liberius adduced by St. Hilary confirm the point in question.[405] The assertion then that the third Sirmian formula was signed by Pope Liberius rests only on the authority of Sozomen. But the authority of the Greek historian is not sufficient to demonstrate the fall of Liberius. For it is certain that the third Sirmian formula was not definitively framed and sanctioned at Sirmium before the 23rd of May, 359; since it was put forth in the consulate of Flavius Eusebius and Hypatius, as St. Athanasius and Socrates inform us.[406] Now Pope Liberius had returned to Rome in the course of the previous year, 358, for his exile did not last beyond two years.[407] He was therefore at Rome before the third formula of faith had been brought from Ancyra to Sirmium, and examined and sanctioned by the assembled Fathers.

[402] S. Hilarius, Fragm. vi., n. 8 (Migne, t. ii., p. 693). He implies this by the insertion of the spurious Letters. Philostorgius, l. c.

[403] S. Hilarius, Fragm. vi., n. 7 (Migne, Op., t. ii., p. 692); S. Hieron., *De Viris Illustribus*, cap. 97 (Op., t. ii., p. 931. Edit. Vallarsii); in *Chronico an.* 352 (Op., t. viii., p. 797); Ado, *Martyrologium*, Aug. 14.

[404] St. Hilary, l. c., pp. 691, 694.

[405] Fragm. iv., p. 678, seq.; Fragm. vi., n. 5, p. 688, seq.; n. 8, p. 693, seq.; n. 10, p. 695.

[406] St. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, n. 8 (Op., t. ii., p. 576); Socrates, l. ii., cap. xxxvii., p. 306 (Edit. Migne).

[407] Baronius, Pagi, and Tillemont were of this opinion. Stilting confirmed it with new arguments. See *Act. SS.*, t. vi., Sept. 23; *De Sancto Liberio*, sec. viii., p. 594, seq.

Consequently, Sozomen was deceived when he asserted that Pope Liberius signed at Sirmium a formula of faith written by the Arian party.

Again, if Liberius had made the required concession, how could it happen that the Roman people, the firm adherents of the faith of Nicæa, received him with so much enthusiasm? The return of Liberius wore the appearance of a triumphal procession, as we learn from St. Jerome, as well as from Faustinus and Marcellinus, or the anonymous author of the Preface attributed to them.[408] Moreover, historians such as Theodoret and Cassiodorus spoke of him on his return from exile as of a great, an admirable, and a holy man, as of a glorious champion of the truth, and worthy of all praise.[409] It is incredible that a Pastor who had been guilty at least of weakness should have deserved so glorious an encomium, especially from the pen of a Greek writer. But there is much more than this. The Council of Rimini was assembled in 359, for the very purpose of inducing the Western Bishops to subscribe the third formula of Sirmium, in which the word *Homöousios* was suppressed; the Oriental Bishops were to meet for the same purpose at Seleucia of Isauria.[410] Valens, Ursacius, and Germanius, the leaders of the semi-Arian party, were commissioned to make every effort to procure the acceptance of the formula by the four hundred and forty Bishops assembled together at Rimini. Now, if Pope Liberius had already assented

[408] *Libellus Precum ad Imperatores*, Præfatio, n. i. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xiii., p. 81); S. Hieronymus, *Chron. an.* 352 (Op., t. viii., p. 797).

[409] Theodoret, l. ii., cap. xiv. (Op., t. iii., p. 1040, seq.); Cassiodorus, *Hist. Tripart.*, l. v., cap. xviii. (Op., t. i., p. 245. Edit. Venetiis, 1729).

[410] Socrates, l. ii., cap. xxxvii., p. 302, seq. (Edit. Migne); Sozomen, l. iv., cap. xvi., p. 1160, seq. (Edit. Migne); Theodoret, l. ii., cap. xv., p. 1042, seq. (Edit. Migne).

to this formula, why was he not summoned to attend the Council? and why was not his consent quoted there as affording a powerful argument to seduce the Catholic Bishops, who were steady in rejecting the semi-Arian formula? On the first opening of the Synod they condemned the proposed formulary, and even pronounced a sentence of excommunication against its supporters. Why then did not the latter shelter themselves under the example of Pope Liberius? why was all mention of his fall omitted from the synodical letter addressed to the Emperor Constantius? Why did no Catholic Bishop raise his voice to protest against an act which rendered Liberius at least suspected of heresy, especially seeing that we have no trace of any act performed or even contemplated by the Pope in reparation of the scandal which he had given? And why was not the Papal act mentioned when the Catholic Bishops, wearied out at length by the cruel vexations of the Emperor and the Arian leaders, at length yielded, and with inexcusable weakness adopted the identical creed which at the beginning of the Council they had anathematised? If Pope Liberius had given to that very formula the sanction of his signature, Ursacius and Valens would have found in the circumstance a most serviceable argument to overcome the scruples of the Catholic Prelates. Yet absolute silence was observed with regard not only to the fall itself, but also to the Letters, which, if genuine, must have been notorious at the time, and which were never retracted by any public document of which the smallest trace has been preserved in history. There is still more. The Bishops of Rimini who had been allured into error, or deceived, immediately after the Synod took the right view of the matter, repenting of their fall, and applying to the Pope for reconciliation. On this occasion Liberius displayed great zeal for the faith which had apparently been

betrayed by the act of Rimini; he made every effort to impede, if possible, the injurious results of this false step of the Bishops;[411] he received the penitent Prelates, but he took care to impose on them terms and conditions of reconciliation.[412] Nevertheless, while doing this, he made no mention either of his own fall, supposed to have taken place in the preceding year, or of any retractation by himself. And still he is called by St. Basil *the most blessed Bishop*,[413] and by Cassiodorus is spoken of as *most holy*;[414] he is one of the Popes whom the Church venerates on the altar. How is it possible that a holy Pontiff, while inflicting punishment on penitent Bishops, who had been forced by fear and deception to approve a formula liable to suspicion of heresy, neglects to give the least proof of his own repentance and penance, when he had been guilty of the same fault? It is unaccountable. Moreover, just after the Council of Rimini, a Synod met at Alexandria (362), which was summoned by St. Athanasius and sanctioned by Pope Liberius.[415] It was attended by St. Eusebius of Vercelli, a Bishop, who must have been well acquainted with occurrences in Italy, and especially with all that regarded the Pope. Now the Acts of the Council, by order of the Fathers, were sent to Rome to Pope Liberius, from whom the Decree of faith against the Arians was to receive confirmation. Nay, Eusebius himself was appointed to go to Rome, and to present himself to the Pope with the Decree enacted at

[411] See *Epist.* xi. *Liberii Papæ* (Labbe, t. ii., p. 809); *Epist.* xiii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 811, seq.).

[412] *Epist. Liberii ad Episc. Macedonianos.* In Socrate, l. iv., cap. xii., p. 491, seq.

[413] S. Basilius, *Epist.* 263, n. 3 (Op., t. iv., p. 406. Edit. Maurin).

[414] Cassiodorus, *Hist. Trip.*, l. c.

[415] Conc. Alexandrinum (Penes Labbe, t. ii., p. 937, seq.); et in Conc. Nicæn. ii., Act. i. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 715, seq.).

Alexandria. Liberius not only received him with extraordinary joy, but he sanctioned the Decree of faith, accepted the profession made by Eusebius, and spoke in the highest terms of his firmness and generosity in supporting the Nicene belief.[416] Facts of this kind are unintelligible if we believe in the fall of Liberius. Neither the passages of St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, St. Jerome, and others, nor the famous Letters of Liberius concerning his fall, will be insurmountable difficulties against this our assertion. They have already been explained away by Stilting, Zaccaria, and many others, and recently by the learned Dumont. We will refer our readers to these authors; and therefore can afford to be brief in this part of our apology for the great Pontiff.

Two passages of St. Athanasius are quoted to disprove the innocence of Pope Liberius. The first is taken from his Apology against the Arians. "Liberius," he says, "did not endure to the end the sufferings of banishment, but yet stood out two years in exile."[417] The other is found in his History of the Arians: "Liberius, after he had been in banishment two years, gave way, and from fear of threatened death, subscribed" (357).[418] Now the first of the two passages, even if it implies the fall of Liberius, which meaning is doubtful, cannot be of the pen of St. Athanasius.

[416] "Romam veniens (Eusebius Vercellensis) Liberium Papam adiit quem summo gaudio Liberius excipiens, collegam illis se fore congratulabatur; ostenditque ei beatus Eusebius fidei decretum, quod ipse et Athanasius vir gloriosus Alexandriæ peregerunt cum cæteris Orientalibus Episcopis, utique ab ipso comprobandum" (See *Vita S. Eusebii Vercellensis.* In Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, t. iv., p. 759. Venetiis, 1719).

[417] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, n. 89 (Op., t. i., p. 161).

[418] St. Athanasius, *Hist. Arianorum*, n. 41 (Op., t. i., p. 291).

Stilting[419] and Zaccaria[420] have already proved that the Apology against the Arians was written by St. Athanasius before the supposed fall of the Pope, and therefore the passage in question cannot be attributed to him. Tillemont,[421] and in our own time Hefele,[422] have replied to this that St. Athanasius made additions and corrections in his Apology at a later date, and then sent it to Serapion, a Bishop of the Thebais. But it is impossible that the words which we have quoted should have been inserted on this occasion. For, had the author himself made this addition when revising his work, he would at the same time have suppressed the passage which follows soon after, where he points out the heroic examples of Liberius and Hosius, who teach us how to fight to the last for truth's sake.[423] These words are irreconcilable with the passage in question. Consequently, the latter cannot be admitted as drawn up by St. Athanasius. Again, Stilting[424] and Zaccaria[425] remark that the second passage quoted by our adversaries is also spurious, because the History of the Arians was written by St. Athanasius some years before the fall of Liberius. But here, too, Hefele observes that St. Athanasius, after having recalled that history, corrected it in several places, and made many additions to

[419] Stilting, Op. cit., sec. viii., n. 119, seq. (*Acta SS.*, l. c., p. 599, seq.).

[420] Zaccaria, *De Commentitio Liberii lapsu*, cap. iv., p. 292, seq.

[421] Tillemont, *Mém. d'Hist. Eccl.*, n. 81, in S. Athanasium, t. viii., p. 1195, seq.

[422] *Hist. des Conciles*, sec. 81, t. ii., p. 63, seq. Paris, 1869.

[423] *Apolog. contra Arian.*, n. 90, p. 162. "Testes . . . Liberium et Hosium, eorumque Socios, qui cum adversum nos gesta facinora conspicerent, extrema pati maluerunt, quam aut veritatem aut judicium nostri gratia datum prodere."

[424] Stilting, l. c., n. 126, seq. (l. c., p. 601, seq.).

[425] Zaccaria, l. c., n. ii., seq., p. 292, seq.

it.[426] But we in turn ask the learned writer, how can he prove that the holy Doctor made this particular addition with regard to the fall of Pope Liberius? On the contrary, the logical course of that part of his history seems to exclude the possibility; since his narrative is interupted by an inopportune parenthesis which is out of harmony with the rest. For St. Athanasius just before these words had related the glorious combat and exile of Pope Liberius and his Legates, and he remarks that the semi-Arians had endeavoured to overcome the Roman Church by carrying it into the ways of iniquity. After this he goes on: "There is nothing which these men have not attempted in favour of their heresy; but in all the Churches the people hold the faith which they have learnt, and expect their masters in the faith." These words would be logically linked to the preceding sentence, were it not that the inserted parenthesis has broken the natural course of the narrative and dislocated its structure. Certainly if St. Athanasius had received authentic information of the fall of Liberius, he would not have hinted at so important a circumstance in a kind of parenthesis, but he would have sketched it with the most impressive colours, as was his custom whenever he delineated important events. Finally, the inserted words make the two sentences contradict each other, and consequently they betray the hand of a copyist, who has adulterated the narrative of St. Athanasius. At all events, it is not the only case in which the works of the Doctors of the Church have received spurious insertions from the enemies of the faith, or from imprudent copyists. And if the passage belongs to St. Athanasius, how is it that Theodoret, who was indebted to the writings of the Saint for the facts of his history, shows himself absolutely ignorant of the fall of the great Pontiff? Did

[426] Hefele, Op. cit., l. c.

he perhaps conceal it, as Coustant seems to suspect?[427] There is not the least historical ground for such an imputation.

As to the fragments attributed to St. Hilary, our task is easier; for Dr. Hefele himself, as well as Zaccaria and Stilting, regard them as clearly spurious.[428] Consequently, we have a preliminary ground to doubt the authenticity of the Letters attributed to Liberius, and inserted in these fragments, by which his fall is admitted and justified. Hefele maintains that these too are spurious;[429] and in truth the fact is beyond controversy.[430] We will refer to Dr. Hefele and the others for the evident contradictions and gross mistakes which disfigure the fragments (especially the sixth) attributed to St. Hilary. But we will only remark that the Saint having returned from Phrygia in 360, after four years of exile, could not pronounce his anathemas against the Supreme Head of the Church with whom he was in communion, when, as all suppose, he had repaired his fault, and was then exerting himself in favour of the Nicene faith. Even if St. Hilary had been fully acquainted with the Pope's fall, it would have been a

[427] Coustant, *Epist. RR. PP.*, n. A. in *Epist.* x. *Liberii*, p. 441. Mr. Renouf in his note has translated into an absolute assertion what Coustant has stated hypothetically against Theodoret, namely, that "he knew the whole truth (about Liberius' fall), though he was unwilling to publish it" (p. 46 of the *Condemnation of Pope Honorius*).

[428] Hefele, Op. cit., sec. 81, t. ii., p. 73, seq.

[429] *Ibid.*, Op. cit., l. c., p. 67, seq.

[430] Mr. Renouf does not understand this; and while he audaciously condemns as spurious, for the slightest reasons, every document that tells in favour of Papal Infallibility; while he most unjustly declares the classical work of the learned Stilting to be "one of the most mischievous productions ever written;" he entertains not the slightest doubt concerning the genuineness of the three Letters of Liberius, as well as of St. Hilary's Fragments. It is the old criticism of Dupin and Tillemont.

piece of criminal audacity in him to stigmatise with his anathemas the Supreme Pastor of the Church after his supposed reparation.

With regard to the Letters of Liberius, it is certain that the Arians circulated several spurious Letters, pretending them to have been dictated by Pope Liberius. In fact, all admit that of the fifteen Letters which bear his name, the eighth and the twelfth, and the last two, are forgeries.[431] This raises at once a grave doubt as to the authenticity of the other three Letters addressed to the Eastern Bishops, to the semi-Arian chiefs, and to Victor of Capua, which are quoted as convincing proofs of the fall of Liberius. And when these three Letters are themselves looked into, evident marks are discernible proving the ignorance and folly of their author. We do not lay so much stress on the barbarous style in which they are written, as on the low tone of the sentiments and the palpable contradictions, which it is impossible to attribute to the great Pope who braved the anger of the Emperor Constantius rather than condemn Athanasius, and thereby betray the faith of Nicæa.

Neither can any difficulty be created by the two passages of St. Jerome which we mentioned above. This holy Doctor's tendency to give too ready credence to unauthorised rumours is well known. Thus, as is pointed out by Zaccaria, he represents St. Chrysostom as an Origenist, and he adopts the falsehoods spread abroad by the adherents of Paulinus to the prejudice of St. Meletius of Antioch.[432] We cannot then feel surprised if he uses language implying that Liberius yielded to the demands of the Arians; the calumnies

[431] Tillemont alone thought to prove the authenticity of Liberius' eighth Letter (*Mém. d'Hist. Eccl.*, t. viii., art. lxiv., p. 233, et n. lxviii., p. 1177, seq.); but Stilting has made a very remarkable exposure of the weakness of his arguments.

[432] Zaccaria, *De Comm. Liberii lapsu*, cap. iv., n. iv., p. 316, seq.

of the heretics were spread everywhere, and St. Jerome was deceived: the existence of such reports is proved by a passage of Sozomen.[433] Moreover, it is admitted on all hands that the *Chronicon* of St. Jerome is full of interpolations; and in some very ancient manuscripts there is no trace of mention of the fall of Liberius.[434] The passage in the book *De Viris Illustribus* is in open contradiction with the *Chronicon*, and is manifestly false. Thus, we read in the *Chronicon* that the hardships of exile forced Liberius to give way and sign an heretical formula; according to the Catalogue, he did so before going into exile, being persuaded to this act by Bishop Fortunatianus: so that we have here a discrepancy of two years between the accounts. Again, St. Jerome would certainly never have written as he did concerning Fortunatianus, had he not been deceived by the calumnious reports propagated by the Arians. It is untrue that this Prelate signed any formula at Milan which was heretical, or even open to suspicion; he was induced to promise that he would interrupt his communion with St. Athanasius; but most cruel violence was necessary to extort from him even this promise, and with regard to the faith itself, he never flinched. What we here say is proved by unimpeachable testimony,[435] while there is absolutely no document which even seems to say the contrary. We may therefore safely conclude that Liberius was not induced by Fortunatianus to sign an heretical formula.

We will add only a few words with regard to the Preface to the *Libellus Precum* presented to the

[433] Sozomen, l. iv., cap. xv., p. 1151. Edit. Migne.

[434] See Zaccaria, l. c., n. v., p. 317.

[435] *Epist. Liberii Papæ ad Eusebium Vercel.*, n. 8 (Coustant, p. 428); St. Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium*, n. 27 (Op., t. i., p. 247); Sulpitius Severus, l. ii., n. xxxix., p. 15 (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xx.).

Emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius, the authorship of which is attributed to Faustinus and Marcellinus, contemporaries of Liberius. Baronius and Lupus may be excused for believing in the authenticity of this document; but after the proof of its spuriousness had been laid before the world by Zaccaria, Mr. Renouf ought not to have appealed to its authority as if it were not open to the slightest doubt.[436] As to the passage in the Martyrology of Ado, which represents Liberius as having consented to the Arian perfidy, it is well known that Ado drew some of his materials from unreliable sources; and the words in question do not occur either in the Martyrology of Usuard or in that of Rome, published by Baronius. A few minor difficulties remain, but they do not seem to call for particular notice.

[436] See Zaccaria, Op. cit., cap. vi., n. i.—iii., p. 314, seq.; Renouf, *Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 42.

SECTION IX.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE AND THE SECOND AND THIRD ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.

THE name of Liberius so frequently occurs in this controversy in connection with his alleged fall, as to cause frequent forgetfulness that one of the strongest proofs of Papal Infallibility is derived from the Acts of this very Pontiff. The materials of the argument are found in the historian Sozomen. The Macedonian heretics, derived from Macedonius, the semi-Arian Bishop of Constantinople, were widely spread over Syria, Egypt, Pontus, and Cappadocia. They maintained that the Holy Ghost differs in substance from the Father. After mentioning this, Sozomen goes on: "The Bishop of Rome (then Liberius), on hearing that this question was agitated with great acrimony, and that the contention seemed daily to increase, wrote to the Churches of the East, and urged them to receive the doctrine upheld by the Western Clergy, namely, that the Three Persons of the Trinity are of the same substance, and of equal dignity."[437] Now here we find, first, that a controversy of faith which arose in the East, is referred to the Roman Pontiff; secondly, that he, acting according to his lawful authority, pronounces a definition of faith, and sends it to the Churches of the East, that they should profess the same doctrine as was upheld by the West. Let us

[437] Sozomen, l. vi., cap. xii., p. 1348. English version, p. 282. London, 1846.

suppose then for a moment that the Pope was not infallible, and that he was not regarded as such in the Church; in that case, Liberius would have been guilty of great presumption, and all the Churches of the East would have protested against his illegal interference and usurpation. Now no protest was heard from the Eastern Churches, but they, as Sozomen adds, ceased from any dispute on that subject, and kept in peace. And the same historian assigns as a reason for this change, the decision of the Roman Church—that is to say, of Pope Liberius. So that "the question having been thus once terminated by the Roman Church, each of them kept quiet, and an end was put to the debate."[438] The judgment, therefore, of Pope Liberius is treated by the Greek historian as definitive, and the consequences of that judgment are peace and an end of the controversy. This clearly implies the full intellectual submission of the contending Prelates to the definition of the Roman Pontiff: because Pope Liberius did not require them to carry out any disciplinary regulation, nor merely abstain from condemning the contrary doctrine, but he expressly required of all the Eastern Churches that they should profess the doctrine of the West. Consequently, their submission must undoubtedly imply that they believed in the infallibility of the Supreme Teacher of the Church.

Bossuet, referring to this passage of Sozomen, remarks that the Greek writer only says that "the controversy seemed to have had an end;"[439] and he thinks that if the sentence of the Pope had been infallible, the author ought to have said that an end was put to the debate, not that it seemed to have been put. As he holds, a General Council was necessary to settle

[438] Sozomen, l. c.

[439] *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xii., cap. viii., p. 161, seq.

the matter. But the very words used by Sozomen could be applied even to the Nicæan or to any other Ecumenical Council. For instance, the Decree of Chalcedon was infallible. But nevertheless, the controversy with the various Monophysite sects lasted for more than two centuries from the time of the definition. It could therefore be said with truth that the definition of Chalcedon seemed to have put an end to the Monophysite controversy, although the fact turned out otherwise; and this would not impeach the irreformability of the judgment pronounced at Chalcedon. We must say the same of the Decree of Liberius. And, in fact, in virtue of the profession of faith imposed by the Roman Pontiff, the Macedonians who submitted to it were regarded as Catholics, and as such were received in the Synod assembled at Tyana.[440] Sozomen, therefore, on mentioning the reason for which the two contending parties dropped their dispute, says that the controversy had already received a formal judgment from the Roman Church.[441] Mgr. Maret was well aware that those who defend Papal Infallibility would lay great stress on the words of this text. He therefore passes them over, and contents himself with quoting a subsequent part of the passage![442]

Again, Damasus, successor of Liberius in the Roman See, regarded the error of the Macedonians as a manifest heresy, and therefore, though no question was then agitated on the subject, he repeatedly condemned and anathematised their opinions, first in a Roman Council held in 369, and again in the profession of faith which

[440] Hefele, Op. cit., t. ii., sec. 88, p. 120.

[441] ὡς ἐπικεκριμένοις ἅπαξ παρὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων Ἐκκλησίας, ἡσυχίαν ἦγον ἕκαστοι (Sozomen, l. c.). See Orsi, *De R. Pontif. Auctoritate*, l. i., cap. viii., t. i., p. 40, seq.

[442] Maret, *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. iii., t. i., p. 165, n. 4.

he sent to Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch.[443] In the formula of faith drawn up in the Roman Synod, he defined in the most explicit manner the consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost with the Father and the Son;[444] and in the profession of faith sent to Paulinus of Antioch he anathematised the Macedonians as on a par with the Arians, the Eunomians, and the other heretics.[445] And further, in the same Roman Synod this very Pontiff pronounced a definitive sentence against Apollinaris and his disciple Timothy, who had taught that the Divine Nature in Christ supplied the place of the intellectual principle of His Humanity, and performed its functions. Pope Damasus, without the aid of any Ecumenical Council, not only deposed both these heretics and anathematised their errors, but also, in his Letter to the Oriental Bishops, he openly declared that his sentence was definitive; for he pointed out that his condemnation had deprived the doctrines of Apollinaris of whatever plausibility they had possessed, and that henceforward they would be the ruin of the souls that embraced them in opposition to the universal rule of the Church.[446] The Pontiff gives the name *rule of the Church* to his own Definition against Apollinaris. But it could not be the rule of the Church if it were not the expression of the Church's infallible judgment.

It is due to this infallible character that the definitions of Pope Damasus were received by all the

[443] *Epist.* iv., sive *Expositio fidei transmissa in Orientem* (Coustant, p. 495, seq.); *Epist.* v., sive *Expositio fidei Cath. ad Paulinum* (Coustant, p. 518, seq.).

[444] *Epist.* iv., n. 1, l. c.

[445] *Epist.* v., n. 1, l. c.

[446] See Epist. cit. Damasi, et *Epist.* xiv. ejusdem, nn. 2, 3 (Coustant, pp. 571—574). "Prophanum Timotheum cum impio ejus dogmate damnavimus: nec reliquias ejus deinceps ulla ratione valituras esse confidimus. . . . Cum illo pariter peribit qui Ecclesiæ regulam vult repugnare."

Church as dogmatic definitions, which were adopted by all. This is fully proved by Cardinal Orsi,[447] the study of whose work on the Papal authority would save our adversaries from many mistakes. We will point out a few of the principal documents on the subject. The first is found in the Synod of Antioch, in which all the Oriental Bishops were duly represented. They received the profession of faith sent to them by Pope Damasus through Dorotheus, and subscribed it, joining with the Pontiff in condemning the heresies both of Macedonius and of Apollinaris.[448] The other belongs to the Synod of Illyricum. Theodoret has preserved us the synodical letter forwarded by the Fathers of that Council to the Bishops of Asia, Phrygia, Cataphrygia, and Pacatiana. In it they anathematise all who do not confess that the Holy Ghost is of the same substance with the Father and the Son.[449] But their profession of faith was an echo of that which they had received in the synodical letter communicated to them by Pope Damasus.[450] The Emperors, also, Valentinian and Gratian, bear witness to the same. For in the imperial letter addressed to the dioceses of Asia by Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, concerning the decision of the Synod of Illyricum, the doctrines of the Council are summed up, and particular mention is made of the Synod held by Damasus at Rome, whose faith they profess that they maintain.[451]

[447] Op. cit., l. i., cap. viii., art. ii., p. 42—48.

[448] See Coustant, p. 500, where the signatures of the Synod of Antioch may be seen annexed to the profession of faith written by Pope Damasus.

[449] See Theodoret, l. iv., cap. x., p. 1138, seq. (Op., t. iii. Edit. Migne). See also Labbe, t. ii., p. 1061.

[450] Theodoret, l. ii., cap. xxii. (In Migne, cap. xvii., p. 1051, seq.); Sozomen, l. vi., cap. xxiii., p. 1350, seq. Edit. Migne.

[451] In Theodoret, l. iv., cap. viii. (In Migne, cap. vii., p. 1138).

For other documents to the same effect concerning the Churches of Asia, Galatia, Lycaonia, &c., we refer our readers to Cardinal Orsi himself, who has treated this matter with great clearness and erudition.[452] We will only remark that (1.) the heresy of the Macedonians and that of Apollinaris were peremptorily condemned by Pope Damasus without any previous consent of all the Bishops; (2.) that these condemnations were, by authentic and public acts, solemnly received by all the Bishops as dogmas of faith. Hence we conclude that long before the General Council of Constantinople, all the Church had agreed in acknowledging the errors of the Macedonians and of Apollinaris to be heresies: and that this consent was due to the infallible definitions of the Pope. Moreover, at that time no controversy was agitated on the points infallibly defined by Popes Liberius and Damasus; more particularly, as the Emperor Theodosius I. by his imperial decree of 380, which was to be transmitted to the remotest towns of his dominions, had ordered that those were to be regarded as heretics who should not render equal homage to the Three Persons of the Trinity, or should refuse to profess the faith of Pope Damasus and of the Bishop of Alexandria.[453]

Notwithstanding the clear proof that exists of the Macedonians and Apollinarists having been regarded as heretics before the Second Ecumenical Council, Mgr. Maret still follows Bossuet in maintaining that this Council met in order to anathematise those heresies, and that such a meeting was necessary for the purpose. Not one of the Greek historians, not one ancient document, gives any countenance to such assertions.

[452] Op. cit., l. c., p. 44, seq.

[453] Sozomen, l. vii., cap. iv., p. 1423; *Codex Theodosianus* l. xvi., tit. i., l. ii. (Gothofredi, t. vi., pt. i, p. 5. Lipsiæ, 1741).

In fact, the Greek historians, Socrates,[454] Sozomen,[455] and Theodoret,[456] unanimously testify that the Council of Constantinople was assembled for two reasons: first, for the confirmation of the faith of Nicæa, and, secondly, for the election of the Bishop of Constantinople. This Synod, then, from its first beginning was not regarded as Ecumenical. But even if it had been considered as Ecumenical from its very opening, that would not prove that it was assembled in order to pass a peremptory condemnation on the heresies of Macedonius and Apollinaris. It is true that in the First Canon of the Synod the Macedonians and the Apollinarists are condemned, but they are condemned in the same terms as the Arians, the Eunomians, and other heretics, who had already been infallibly condemned in the Council of Nicæa.[457] Therefore it is clear that the Fathers of Constantinople merely renewed the sentence already passed against these heresies and heresiarchs, whether by the Popes or by the Nicæan Council. But their Canon does not in the least affect the infallible authority of the condemnation pronounced by Pope Damasus against the Macedonians and the Apollinarists. This fact was always so evident that even the French Bishops, in their letter to Innocent X.,[458] when they submitted to the Constitution issued against the propositions of Jansenius, openly declared that the anathemas inflicted by Pope Damasus on the errors of Macedonius and Apollinaris were irreversible, even

[454] Socrates, l. v., cap. viii., p. 175. Edit. Migne. "Imperator . . concilium convocat, quo et Nicæna fides confirmaretur et Constantinopoli ordinaretur Episcopus" (Versio Valesii).

[455] Sozomen, l. vii., cap. vii., p. 1430.

[456] Theodoret, l. v., cap. viii., p. 1210. Edit. Migne.

[457] Conc. Constantinop. i., Can. i. (Labbe, t. ii., p. 1132).

[458] See the letter in Sfondrati, *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. iv., sec. ii., p. 782 (S. Galli. Edit. 1702); and in Rohrbacher, *Hist. Un. de l'Eglise Cath.*, l. 87, t. xxv., p. 422 (Edit. 1847).

before the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople. Again, the Fathers of Constantinople, though acting as judges, received the rule of faith sanctioned by Pope Damasus and his predecessor, and by so doing proved themselves true members, under the Supreme Head, of the living Church. In their definitions they simply followed the definition of the Pope, and by adhering to him they gave a new witness at once to the indissoluble unity of the Church and to the infallibility of its Head.

During the course of about half a century, from the Second General Council down to the Third, the Popes acted with regard to controversies of faith as they had ever acted. New heresies arose, and new condemnations came down from the Pontifical *magisterium*, which, without any General Synod, struck at the root of the evil, and restored peace to the Church. Jovinian, an apostate Monk, ventured to attack the perpetual virginity of the Mother of God. St. Jerome wrote against him in the most vehement terms, but it was Pope Siricius who inflicted the death-blow on him and his heresy, by an infallible condemnation addressed to all the Bishops of the Catholic Church. "Having held a Synod," he says in his Encyclical Letter, "we have found that the doctrine of Jovinian is contrary to *our doctrine, that is to say, to the doctrine of Christ*, and therefore all the Clergy were convinced that Jovinian, Auxentius, and the rest, having been condemned for ever by *Divine* sentence and *our judgment*, should be expelled from the Church. On this account I address this Letter to your Holiness, that our Decree may be observed."[459] The language of Siricius is the language of the Apostles in the first Council of Christianity: "It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."[460] This

[459] Siricius Papa, *Epist.* vii. *ad omnes Episcopos*, n. 4 (Coustant, pp. 667, 668).

[460] Act. Apost. xv. 28.

is the language of all the Popes when exercising their supreme authority in judgments of faith. They were fully aware, in the exercise of their *magisterium*, that they were the organs of God's Word, and that their *magisterium* was infallible. For this reason, as we have proved at length in another section of this work, Bishops and Patriarchs applied to the Pope as soon as a controversy of faith arose. And we have an instance of this in the age which we are considering. John, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, in alarm at the rapid spread of Origenistic errors in Syria and Palestine, complied with the suggestion of Ruffinus, and wrote to entreat Pope Anastasius to restrain these heresies by his formal act of condemnation.[461]

But in the early part of the fifth century a new heresy arose, the history of which afforded a striking illustration of the infallible authority of the Pope in matters of faith. The Pelagian heresy attacked at once the existence of original sin, and the necessity of supernatural grace to meritorious actions. We have already spoken of this important subject in the third section of the present work,[462] and a very few remarks will here suffice. Two Councils were held at Carthage and Milevis, with the view of checking the Pelagian heresy, but these assemblies well understood that their Decrees could not avail for the thorough destruction of the new error unless they were strengthened by the authority of the Roman Pontiff. Accordingly they referred the whole matter to him, begging him to pronounce the condemnation of the heresy.[463] This

[461] Anastasius Papa, *Epist.* ii. *ad Joannem Jerosol.* (Coustant, p. 723, seq.); S. Hieronymus, *Epist.* lxxxviii. *ad Theophilum Patr.* (Op., t. i., p. 537. Edit. Vallarsii).

[462] P. 59, seq.

[463] *Epist. Conc. Carthag. ad Innocentium Papam* (Coustant, p. 867, seq.); *Epist. Conc. Milevitani ad eumdem* (*Id.*, p. 873, seq.).

conduct of theirs was in conformity with the Apostolic tradition, and testified to their sense that the divine constitution of the Church is grounded on the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. The Letters of Innocent, addressed to these Councils, set forth the same principles with perfect distinctness, and the Bishops received these Letters with veneration; registering them, as we saw above, among the records of their Churches; so that, two centuries later, we find the very words of Innocent's third Letter quoted by the African Prelates in a letter to Pope Theodore.[464] Councils alone had failed to set the Pelagian question at rest, but we learn from St. Augustine himself how great was the efficacy of the Papal sentence. His words are well known—"De causa Pelagiana duo concilia missa sunt ad Sedem Apostolicam. Inde etiam rescripta venerunt. *Causa finita est.*"[465] The words of the holy African Doctor are in perfect accord with what is said by Sozomen of the Decree issued by Pope Liberius against the Macedonians. But, moreover, St. Augustine makes us acquainted with the reason why a cause of faith is terminated by the sentence of the Apostolical See. "By the Letters of Pope Innocent I.," he said, in another of his works, "an end was put to the state of uncertainty on that subject."[466] We see, then, that according to the doctrine of St. Augustine the Pelagian controversy was entirely terminated, without any Ecumenical Synod, by the sole authority of Pope Innocent: and the reason is because the judgment of the Pope is not only the expression of the supreme ruling power intrusted to him over the Church, but it is also an

[464] See section iii. of this book, p. 50, seq.

[465] *Serm.* cxxxi., cap. x., n. 10 (Op., t. v., p. 734. Edit. Migne).

[466] "Litteris beatæ memoriæ Innocentii de hac re, dubitatio tota sublata est" (*Contra Duas Epist. Pelag.*, l. ii., cap. iii., n. 5. Op., t. x., p. 574. Edit. Migne).

infallible utterance, which must by itself dispel all clouds of doubt and uncertainty in doctrines of faith. Likewise when, two years later, in the Council of Carthage, the 214 assembled Bishops condemned the hypocrite Celestius, their synodical Decrees were sent to the Roman Pontiff, that he might pronounce his final sentence against the heretic. Pope Zosimus did condemn him, and the result of his Pontifical decision was, as St. Prosper informs us, that the whole Catholic world joined in the condemnation, and rejected the errors which Celestius had maintained with so much hypocrisy.[467] The Saint asserts this repeatedly.[468] The whole Catholic world submitted implicitly to the judgments of Innocent and Zosimus, because all were convinced that the Roman Pontiff is infallible, and that his decisions cannot be reversed nor questioned.[469] Mgr. Maret has passed in silence over the condemnation of Pelagianism. He ought not to have done so. Many Gallican Bishops of a better School have yielded to the testimony borne by the history of these transactions; have acknowledged that the Pelagian controversy was terminated by the sole force of the dogmatic definition pronounced by the Roman Pontiff, and have confessed that the judgment of the Pope fully suffices for the condemnation of new heresies. They founded their conclusions principally upon the passages which we have quoted from St. Augustine. There is no need to quote their words in this place, nor even to

[467] St. Prosper, in *Chronico.*, p. 592 (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. li.). "Synodalibus decretis probatis, per totum orbem Pelagiana hæresis damnata est."

[468] *Ibid.*, *Liber contra Collatorem*, cap. xxi., n. 1, p. 271.

[469] "Patrum traditio Apostolicæ Sedi auctoritatem tantam tribuit, ut de ejus judicio disceptare nullus auderet . . . cum tantum nobis esset auctoritatis, ut nullus possit de nostra retractare sententia" (Zosimus Papa, *Epist.* xii., n. 1. Coustant, pp. 974, 975).

mention their names; we refer our readers to the work of Soardi.[470]

But another heresy arose in the course of the fifth century, more fatal to the Church and more prolific in evil than even the Pelagian error. This was the heresy against the Incarnation which sprang up at Constantinople when the Patriarch Nestorius renewed the false teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Diodorus of Tarsus. Nestorius rejected the hypostatic unity of Christ which is so clearly taught by Scripture and Apostolical tradition; he asserted the agency of two Persons in the Incarnate Word; and consequently he denied to the Blessed Virgin the honour of being the Mother of God (Theotokos). Had this heresy been allowed to gather strength, the whole East might soon have been in a blaze. St. Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria, did not forget the glorious traditions of his Church in the terrible struggle against the Arian heresy. As soon as he perceived the imminent danger, he published learned and solid refutations of the new errors.[471] Moreover, he used persuasion, entreating Nestorius to withdraw from the crooked path on which he had entered, and to spare the Church of Christ the scandal and the evils of a new heresy. On this account a correspondence was opened between the two Patriarchs, which led to no effect but to draw more clearly the line of demarcation between the new error and the Catholic dogma.[472] But Nestorius followed the usual

[470] Soardi, *De Suprema Romani Pontificis Auctoritate*, l. i., cap. iv., sec. i., ii., p. 51, seq. Heidelbergæ, 1793.

[471] *Epistola ad Monachos Ægypti* (Op., t. x., p. 10, seq. Edit. Migne; in Conc. Eph., Act. i. Labbe, t. iii., p. 586, seq.); *Liber de Recta Fide*, in. J. C. ad Theodosium (Op., t. ix., p. 1133, seq. Labbe, t. iii., p. 614, seq.); etc.

[472] *Epist.* ii.—viii. (Op., t. x., p. 39, seq. Labbe, l. c., p. 863, seq.).

course of heretics. He endeavoured to gain for his cause the patronage of the young Emperor, Theodosius II.; while at the same time he addressed himself to Rome, with letters calculated to deceive the Successor of St. Peter, and to gain his favour.[473] In the meanwhile, St. Cyril, though perfectly aware of the heretical character of the doctrines taught by Nestorius, and of his fixed obstinacy in error, did not venture to declare him a heretic, nor to separate from his communion, until he had learnt from the Pope what steps he should take in the matter. "Although," he says, in his letter to the Roman Pontiff, "things are in this state, I have not dared publicly and solemnly to reject his communion (he is speaking of Nestorius) before having laid down the whole matter before your Holiness. Please then to declare what is your judgment in this affair, that we may know with certainty whether we should preserve communion with him, or frankly declare to him that no one can retain his communion, since he holds and teaches such an erroneous doctrine."[474] He goes on to say that all the Eastern Bishops were bound to expect from him the declaration of the faith, that all might defend the unity of the Catholic doctrine. We see then that all the Oriental Bishops, with the Patriarch of Alexandria at their head, were looking out for the supreme and infallible sentence of the Roman Pontiff, that they might unanimously condemn the new heresy and break off all communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Pope Celestine hastened to meet their wishes, and the expectation of the whole Eastern Church. He assembled a Synod at Rome, and examined in it the

[473] *Nestorii Epist. ad Cœlestinum Papam* (Labbe, l. c., pp. 899—901).

[474] *Epist.* xi. (al. ix.) *ad Cœlestinum Papam*, n. 7 (Op., t. x., p. 83. Labbe, l. c., p. 894).

doctrine of Nestorius, confronting this teaching with the Catholic dogma set forth by Cyril in his letters, and in the *Commonitorium* which the Saint had sent to Rome by the hands of Possidonius. Then in a speech delivered to the Fathers, he solemnly anathematised the heresy of Nestorius.[475] Moreover, he communicated his final sentence to the Patriarch Cyril, and declared to him that unless Nestorius should reject his perfidious errors within ten days, by a written profession of faith, he should be separated from the communion of the whole Church. Accordingly, he appointed St. Cyril to execute his sentence in his name and with his authority.[476] At the same time he noted his definitive sentence in the same terms to John, Patriarch of Antioch, and to Nestorius himself, and threatened the heretic with deposition.[477] He wrote, moreover, to the Clergy of Constantinople, who had already issued a solemn protest against the errors of Nestorius;[478] and he declared all sentences pronounced by the Patriarch against the defenders of the Catholic dogma to be null and void.[479] Now Mgr. Maret,[480] with the Gallican School, does not see in these facts anything except an instance of the supreme and universal jurisdiction of

[475] *Commonitorium S. Cyrilli*, etc. (Op., t. x., p. 86, seq. Labbe, t. iii. in *Conc. Rom. contra Nestorium*, p. 554); *Frag. Allocutionis Cœlestini* (Labbe, l. c., p. 555).

[476] "Auctoritate igitur tecum nostræ Sedis adscita, nostra vice usus, hanc exequêris, districto rigore, sententiam, ut aut intra decem dies," etc. (*Epist.* xi. *Cœlestini Papæ ad Cyrillum*, n. 4. Coustant, p. 1106).

[477] *Epist.* xii. *ad Joannem*, etc. (Coustant, p. 1107); *Epist.* xiii. *Cœlestini Papæ ad Nestorium* (Coustant, p. 1114, seq.). The sentence is in n. 11, p. 1130.

[478] *Contestatio Cler. Constantinop. contra Nestorium* (Labbe, Con. Eph., t. x., pt. 1, p. 887).

[479] *Epist.* xiv. *Cœlestini Papæ ad Clerum et populum Constantinop.* (Coustant, p. 1131, seq.).

[480] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. iv., n. ii., t. i., p. 178.

the Roman Pontiff. That the facts summed up here are a plain proof of the divine supremacy of the Pope no one can deny except Protestants, who shut their eyes to the clear lessons of ecclesiastical history. But we contend further that they are an evident proof of Papal Infallibility. In fact, how can it be possible that a Pope should impose on a Patriarch a profession of faith under threat of deposition, unless he were infallible in his utterances? A Pope acting in this manner with the consciousness of liability to error, would be a tyranical despot in the Church. But Pope Celestine was conscious of the infallibility of his *magisterium*, for he plainly declared that his sentence against Nestorius was the Divine sentence of Christ Himself.[481] And the Bishops of the Catholic world regarded this sentence as definitive. In fact, it is certain that all the Bishops of the West, of Africa, of Illyricum, and of Egypt, pronounced against Nestorius the very condemnation which the Roman Pontiff had decreed in the Roman Synod.[482] The Patriarch of Antioch himself, who was an old personal friend of Nestorius, as soon as he received information from the Pope of the sentence inflicted on the Bishop of Constantinople, hastened to exhort him to submit to what was demanded of him by the Roman Pontiff.[483] Moreover, the Oriental Bishops joined with John of Antioch in urging Nestorius to obey; and the Bishop of Antioch mentions their names in the letter to Nestorius;[484] so that all the Catholic

[481] *Epist.* xi. *ad Cyrillum*, n. 5 (Coustant, p. 1107). "Ut nota sit de eo nostra, imo Christi nostri, divina sententia."

[482] See the documents in Orsi, Op. cit., l. i., cap. ix., art. ii., t. i., p. 52, seq.

[483] *Epist. Joannis Antioch. ad Nestorium* (Conc. Eph., Act. i. Labbe, t. iii., p. 939, seq.).

[484] *Ibid.*, n. iv. (Labbe, l. c., p. 944). He says that he wrote his letter in the presence of many Bishops, who perfectly concurred in the sentiments which he expressed.

Bishops were in perfect accord with the Decree of Celestine: and their unanimous reception of his definition, without the least trace of protest or contradiction, constitutes even for the Gallican School the essential character of a dogmatic Decree. We may therefore conclude that the judgment of Celestine against Nestorius was clearly recognised as dogmatic, before the Council of Ephesus was assembled.

In the meanwhile, Nestorius, before receiving information of the Papal sentence, succeeded in persuading the young Emperor Theodosius to call a General Council which should settle the controversy. On the 19th of November, 430, the Emperor published his decree of convocation for an Ecumenical Synod.[485] The imperial *Sacra*, though promulgated three months after the Decree of Pope Celestine in the Roman Council, was yet posterior to the canonical communication of this Decree to the Patriarch Nestorius. St. Cyril, to whom the execution of the Papal judgment was confided, as soon as he received this commission from the hands of the Pope, assembled a Provincial Synod in Alexandria, and in it read the twelve anathemas which he had drawn up against Nestorius. The intimation of the Papal Letters to Nestorius took place about a month (according to Garnier),[486] or a fortnight (if we follow the reckoning of Balutius),[487] after the publication of the *Sacra* of Theodosius; and this explains why Nestorius, in writing to Celestine, mentions the impending Ecumenical Council, but makes no mention

[485] *Sacra Imp. Theodosii ad Cyrillum.* In Act. Conc. Eph., pt. i., cap. xxxi. (Labbe, t. iii., p. 979); *Sacra altera ejusdem ad Cyrillum.* In Act. Conc. Ephes., cap. xxxii. (Labbe, t. iii., p. 983, seq.).

[486] *Dissertiuncula ad Epist. Nestorii ad Cœlestinum Papam* (In Op. Marii Mercatoris, p. 843, seq. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xlviii.).

[487] In Conc. Rom. ii., an. 431 (Labbe, t. iii., p. 559).

of the sentence which had been past at Rome in his case.[488]

We see then that De Marca, Balutius, and Bossuet were mistaken in asserting that the authority of the imperial *Sacra* superseded the sentence pronounced by the Pope.[489] At the time of the publication of the *Sacra*, no authentic information of the existence of this sentence had reached Constantinople; it is therefore impossible to attribute to the imperial law the effect of superseding a legally non-existent decision. Garnier is right in his remark that the *Sacra* may have anticipated the sentence, but cannot have superseded it. Mgr. Maret does not like to carry this point as far as is done by De Marca and Balutius; he does not, indeed, reject their doctrine, but he implies it, merely toning down something of its harshness.[490] But the fact is, that the sentence of the Pope was solemnly communicated to Nestorius in the metropolis of the Empire some weeks after the publication of the imperial edict calling the Council; and no one then dared to protest against the communication, as being an infraction of the imperial law; nor did the Fathers of Ephesus raise the least complaint that the Pope's sentence had been intimated to the Patriarch of Constantinople after the convocation of the Ecumenical Synod.[491] Nevertheless, later on, the execution of the sentence was suspended by the moderation and the prudence of the Pope himself. St. Cyril, on receiving from the Emperor the summons for a General Council, applied to Pope Celestine for instructions as to the period already fixed for the execution of

[488] *Epist. Nestorii ad Cœlestinum Papam;* Int. *Epist. Cœlestini Papæ*, n. xv. (Coustant, p. 1147, seq.).

[489] *De Concordia Sacerd. et Imp.*, l. iv., cap. iv., sec. i., t. i., p. 230, seq. Parisiis, 1663.

[490] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. iv., n. iii., t. i., p. 181, seq.

[491] See Conc. Eph., Act. i. (Labbe, t. iii., p. 1047, seq.).

the sentence of deposition against Nestorius; and also with regard to the manner in which the accused ought to be received in the Council.[492] Celestine wrote to the Patriarch in such a manner as to make him fully aware of his charitable and generous intention towards Nestorius. He reminded St. Cyril of the words of the Scripture, in which it is said that God does not wish the death of any sinner, but, on the contrary, his conversion. On this account he consented to prorogue the execution of his sentence, because of the great desire which he felt for the peace of the Church and for the salvation of the heresiarch.[493] But Celestine never thought for a moment that the sentence pronounced in the Roman Synod was to be reconsidered or examined by the Ecumenical Synod, by which it should be reformed if necessary. Let us look at instructions given by him to the Legates who were appointed to preside in his place in the Ephesine Council. "You," he said in the *Commonitorium* which he gave to them, "must defend the authority of the Apostolic See, and attend the Council. If a controversy should arise among the Fathers, it belongs to you to pass sentence on their judgments, but you shall never submit to enter into argument with them."[494] Nor were these instructions concealed from the knowledge of the Fathers; for in his Letter to the Prelates assembled in Ephesus, the Pope distinctly declares, that he had sent his Legates to the Council, that "they should be present at all the discussions, and faithfully execute the Decrees which he had already enacted," and "to which," he adds, "he was sure that they (the Fathers of Ephesus) would give their

[492] See *Epist.* xvi. *Cœlestini ad Cyrillum*, n. 2 (Coustant, pp. 1150, 1151). The letter of St. Cyril to the Pope is lost.

[493] *Epist.* xxi. cit., l. c.

[494] *Commonitorium Papæ Cœlestini* (Coustant, p. 1152).

consent."[495] Celestine therefore did not regard his decision as in any way liable to be reformed; but, on the contrary, he looked on it as the pattern to which the Synod should conform its own sentence. In other words, the infallible Head of the Church had pronounced his judgment, and the members were bound to show their perfect concurrence. We have here another instance of what we have remarked in the history of the Councils both of Nicæa and of Constantinople. The Roman Pontiff neither withdrew his sentence, nor submitted it to the Episcopal body that it might be sanctioned by them. He only granted a prolongation of the period granted to the heretic for retractation and submission, in the hope that the unanimous and the solemn profession of faith, made by all the Catholic Bishops sitting in General Synod, would either bring the heretical Patriarch to better sentiments, or check his hypocritical artifices, and wrest from him and his followers the weapons which they had used against the Church.

Mgr. Maret,[496] like Bossuet before him,[497] and all the Gallican supporters of the supremacy of the Ecumenical Councils, expresses surprise that the Fathers of Ephesus gave Nestorius the honourable titles usually employed in speaking of Bishops in that age; and he concludes that the Council made no account of the sentence pronounced by the Pope. But there is no ground for wonder that Nestorius was received by the Synod of Ephesus with the titles and the honours due to a Bishop. He was still a Bishop. The Pope himself had granted a delay of the terms fixed in his sentence, and had expressly allowed him to be received in the Assembly of the Bishops as a Bishop. Therefore we

[495] *Epist.* xviii. *Cœlestini ad Conc. Ephes*, n. 5 (Coustant, p. 1162); Conc. Eph., Act. ii. (Labbe, t. iii., pp. 1146, 1147).

[496] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. iv., n. iv., p. 184.

[497] *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xii., cap. xii., p. 167.

must conclude that the Synod acted in accordance with the instructions which the Pope had communicated to its president, St. Cyril. But the Synod of Ephesus, Mgr. Maret considers, like the whole body of Gallican writers, rigorously examined the cause of Nestorius before pronouncing its sentence; it acted as a supreme tribunal; and if it sanctioned Celestine's sentence, it was because, after examination, it found the sentence just.[498] This old difficulty has already received a sufficient answer, both from other writers, and from what is said in the preceding section of this book. The Bishops in Council are indeed true judges of faith; therefore they must necessarily study the question set before them, search all possible documents, and inquire deeply into the whole controversy before pronouncing their final sentence. But this does not prove that the judgment already pronounced by the Pope is susceptible of any correction or any control whatever at the hands of the Bishops. The Fathers sitting in a General Council keep before them as a guide in their researches the doctrine defined by the Pope, and they examine the whole controversy, because it is their business to confute the heretics, and confirm and justify before the world the doctrine defined by the Roman Pontiff. This doctrine is clearly seen in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus. When the Pontifical Legates arrived at the place of meeting, one of them, named Projectus, having laid before the Council the friendly Letter addressed to the Fathers by Pope Celestine, spoke as follows: "Your Holiness should consider the form of the Letter of the holy Pope Celestine, that you may order to be executed whatever he has already defined, according to the rule of the common faith."[499] To whom Firmus, Bishop

[498] *Du Concile Général*, l. c., p. 185, seq.; *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, l. c., capp. xi.—xiii., p. 164, seq.

[499] Conc. Ephes., Act. ii. (Labbe, t. iii., p. 1147).

of Cæsarea, replied in the name of the whole Council: "The Apostolic and holy See of Celestine, most holy Bishop, by the Letters which it sent to us has already prescribed the sentence and the rule to be followed in the present affair. Which form indeed we have followed and executed by pronouncing the canonical and Apostolical judgment against Nestorius."[500] This General Council therefore regarded the sentence of Pope Celestine as the leading principle by which they were to be guided, and from which they could not possibly deviate if they would avoid being misled. The Fathers of Ephesus felt themselves under a moral necessity to follow the decision of the Pope, because Celestine's judgment was to them a rule of faith. This is the reason why they mentioned it in passing their sentence of condemnation upon Nestorius. In this sentence they declare that they are "necessitated" (κατεπειχθέντες) "by the Canons as well as by the Letter of their most holy Father Celestine."[501] And on this form of expression we remark, first, that the Decree of the Pope is classed on the same level with the Canons and the rules of the Church. Again, that it is considered as possessing the same authority with them. Further, the Letter of the Roman Pontiff could not have necessitated an Ecumenical Council to enact a Decree of faith, unless it had contained an infallible dogmatic definition, nor unless it was considered as an infallible utterance by the Synod itself. But the Acts of the Council afford us another no less convincing proof of the same point. When the Letters of Pope Celestine were read, all the assembled Fathers unanimously testified their respect. And in answer, Philip, one of the Papal Legates, addressed the Synod as follows: "We thank the holy and venerable

[500] Conc. Ephes., Act. ii. (l. c.).
[501] Conc. Ephes., Act. i. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1077).

Synod that, the Letters being read to you of our holy and most blessed Pope, you united yourselves to that holy Head by your holy voices and exclamations, as holy members to their holy Head."[502] It is clear that the meaning of the Papal Legate in these words was that the Fathers of Ephesus had given sufficient proof of being trusty members of the Mystical Body of Christ, because they submitted without the least difficulty to the Letters of Pope Celestine. Now if their ready adhesion to the Pontiff's Decree is an evident token of their being true followers of Christ, any disagreement would have been a proof of the opposite. Their submission then was nothing else but the fulfilment of a strict obligation. But how can it possibly be a duty, a divine duty, to submit to a dogmatical Decree, unless this Decree is infallible? Especially when the subject of this obligation is an Ecumenical Council, by which the whole teaching body of the Church is fully represented. Those who deny Papal Infallibility think that they can escape the cogency of this argument by saying that the reason why the Fathers of Ephesus felt obliged to agree with Celestine's Letters was, that they found them to contain the true Apostolic doctrine. The answer is given to this objection by the very Acts of the Second Session of the Synod. When the Papal Legate, Philip, had pronounced the words which we have quoted, Theodotus, Bishop of Ancyra, said in the name of the whole Council: "Almighty God has manifestly shown by the Letters of the most holy Bishop Celestine read here, that the sentence of the Council was just."[503] Now the purport of these words is that the Letters of Celestine contained a rule of faith; therefore, since the judgment of the Council was found to be in conformity with this rule, the justice of the sentence was secured;

[502] Conc. Ephes., Act. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1150).
[503] *Ibid.*, l. c.

for a rule of faith is not liable to error. According then to the persuasion of the Fathers of Ephesus, not only was the Pope's decision infallible, but it was also the infallible guide of their judgments, which were certain to be true and just if in perfect conformity with the Papal declaration. But besides this, it had also been declared by the Bishop of Cæsarea, in the name of the whole Synod, that the Letters of the Pope exhibited the rule of faith which they were bound to follow, and which they really followed. And further, the very formula in which Nestorius was condemned is a new instance in favour of this view.

Let us conclude. The Synod of Ephesus, far from bearing unfavourably on the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, is in truth a splendid monument in its support. The heresy of Nestorius was condemned by the infallible sentence of the Pope; and the Fathers of Ephesus, though acting as judges of faith, were really the faithful executors of his definition.

SECTION X.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE FOURTH AND FIFTH ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.

IN the history of heresy we frequently meet with cases where one error springs out from another directly opposite error. Eutychianism, and all the series of heresies which arose from it, was certainly the offspring of Nestorianism. As Nestorius denied the unity of Person in Christ, so Eutyches and his followers rejected the doctrine that Christ in His Humanity had the same essence as other men, and consequently they maintained that the nature of the flesh of Christ no longer existed after its union with the Godhead. In this manner the whole economy of the Incarnation was destroyed by the heresy of Eutyches no less than by that of his predecessor. Nestorius reduced the mystery of the Incarnation to a moral association of the Word of God with an adoptive man. Eutyches turned it into an absorption, a change, or a mingling of the human nature, by or with the Deity. But as Pope Celestine condemned and defeated the heresy of Nestorius, so Leo the Great checked that of Eutyches, and gave to the whole Church the most luminous exposition of the dogma of Incarnation, which Bossuet himself qualified as "divine, qui a fait l'admiration de toute la terre."[504]

As early as 448, when the new error of Eutyches began to spread in the Eastern provinces, and to

[504] *Hist. des Variations*, l. xiii. (Op., t. iv., p. 679. Edit. of 1863).

threaten the Church with new scandals and schisms, Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, assembled a Synod in that metropolis, that the new heresy might be examined and condemned. Eutyches obstinately refused to retract his doctrine, which was found contrary to the revealed dogma; he was therefore anathematised, deprived of his office, and rejected from the Church. Then the holy Patriarch addressed himself to the Roman Pontiff, requesting him to pronounce at once his sentence against the new heresiarch, as Pope Celestine had before condemned Nestorius. "The cause," he said to the Pope, "needs only your consent and support. If you consent you will restore everything to tranquillity and peace. Thus the heresy which arose, and the factions which originated from it, will, with God's help, be easily exploded by your Letters. Neither will there be any need of a General Council, which is spoken of, and the Churches will be able to remain in peace."[505] These words exhibit Patriarch Flavian as believing in Papal Infallibility. For, had he held the opinion that the Pope's decision did not carry with it an infallible authority, he would not have said that the Papal Letters would be sufficient to stop the rising heresy and to bring the Church to a state of peace. Pope Leo, who had repeatedly proclaimed the infallibility of the Papal teaching, wrote on that occasion his admirable Letter to the Patriarch, in which in the most wonderful manner he set forth the whole doctrine and economy of the Incarnation, and definitively condemned the errors of Eutyches.[506] But the Emperor Theodosius, yielding to the suggestions of the eunuch Chrysantius, and of Dioscorus, the unworthy successor of St. Cyril,

[505] *Epist. Flaviani ad Leonem Papam.* In Actis Conc. Chalced., pt. i. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 778).

[506] *Epist.* xxviii. *Leonis Papæ ad Flavianum* (Op., t. i., p. 801, seq.); in Act. ii. Conc. Chalced. (Labbe, p. 1214, seq.).

had already called a General Synod in Ephesus, and intrusted to it the whole controversy.[507] Pope Leo did not object to the convocation of the Council, although he declared to the Emperor that he judged it quite unnecessary.[508] He appointed Legates of his own to preside at the Synod, and presented to the Fathers his dogmatical Letter to Flavian, as the safe rule of their determinations.[509]

It cannot be doubted that St. Leo regarded his dogmatical Letter as an infallible utterance of his Pontifical *magisterium*.[510] In fact, in it he imposed on Eutyches, as an absolute condition to avoid final condemnation, that he himself should condemn his errors without reserve, and declare that in every particular he adopted the decision which Leo had pronounced.[511] And Eutyches had already submitted himself to the condition imposed on him, and had forwarded to the Pope a *Libellus* to that effect, even before the Synod met at Ephesus.[512] Moreover, in Leo's Letter to the Fathers of Ephesus, quoted above, he expressly intimates that his decisions must be executed; that the Fathers were not to examine the doctrines of Eutyches,

[507] *Epist. Imp. Theodosii ad Proclum Proc. Asiæ.* In Actis Syn. Chalced., Act. i. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 879, seq.).

[508] *Epist. ad Imp. Theodosium.* In pt. i. Act. Conc. Chalced., n. xvii. (Labbe, p. 802).

[509] *Epist.* xxviii. *ad Flavianum*, n. vi. (Op., t. i., p. 836, seq. Edit. Ball.), et *Epist.* xxix. *ad Theod. Imp.* (l. c., p. 840, seq.).

[510] On this point we disagree with Bellarmine, who regards Pope Leo's dogmatical Letter as merely an instruction sent to the Council (*De Concilii Auct.*, l. ii., cap. xix.).

[511] *Epist.* xxviii. *S. Leonis Papam ad Flavianum*, cap. vi. (l. c., p. 836. In Labbe, l. c., pt. i. Act., p. 790).

[512] *Epist.* xxxiii. *S. Leonis Papæ ad Synodum Ephesinam*, cap. ii. (Op., t. i., p. 867, et Labbe, t. iv., p. 798). "Quod etiam in libello quem ad nos miserat est professus spondens per omnia nostram se secuturum esse sententiam." See also *Epist.* xxix. *ad Theodosium Imp.*, l. cit., p. 841.

but to condemn them only, as pestiferous and heretical; that they were not to grant pardon to the heretic unless he should make full and solemn recantation of his heresy by word of mouth, and in writing; in accordance with what he had already promised.[513] Pope Leo, then, did not consider his Letter as reformable by the Synod of Ephesus, or as of doubtful authority, so as to stand in need of support and strength to be received from a General Synod; but, on the contrary, he regarded the Synod as bound to execute his orders and to enforce his Decrees.

At this point of the argument, certain words of Leo's Letter to the Council are brought up by Bossuet[514] as an objection; and Mgr. Maret,[515] as usual, follows in the steps of his predecessor. The words are—"Ut pleniore judicio omnis possit error aboleri."[516] Mgr. Maret remarks—"Ces paroles ne semblent à elles seules pas prouver qui Saint Léon plaçait l'autorité dernière et absolue dans le concert du Pape et des Evêques?" In his work Mgr. Maret is content to repeat literally what is found in the *Defensio Declarationis*, and he takes no notice whatever of the counter observations of Cardinal Orsi, Muzzarelli, and others. And yet this writer makes profession that he intends in particular to refute the two volumes of Muzzarelli, which, it would appear, he has scarcely seen. The method adopted by our opponents, of ignoring what has been said on our side of the controversy, forces us, at the risk of being

[513] *Epist.* xxxiii. *S. Leonis Papæ ad Conc. Ephes.*, cap. ii., l. c. "Hoc est ut primitus pestifero errore damnato, etiam de ipsius, qui imprudenter erravit, restitutione tractetur; si tamen doctrinam veritatis amplectens, sensus hæreticos quibus imperitia ejus fuerit irretita, plene aperteque propria voce et subscriptione damnaverit."

[514] *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gall.*, pt. ii., l. xii., cap. xv., p. 172.

[515] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. v., n. ii., t. i., p. 204.

[516] *Epist.* xxxiii., cap. ii., l. c.

wearisome, to repeat the same point again and again. Mgr. Maret's style of argument might be excused in a Protestant writer, who could not be expected to understand the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; but a Catholic Prelate ought not to affect ignorance of the existence of arguments with which he must be well acquainted.

As it is, we must repeat what we said in our eighth section. When a new heresy has arisen, and when the truth to which it is opposed has been defined by a dogmatic utterance of the Roman See, no need exists for a General Council to assemble for the purpose of enlightening Catholics and leading them into the path of truth. Under such circumstances, a General Council cannot be necessary, or even useful, except for the sake of heretics, that their efforts may be frustrated by the unanimous judgment of the whole Church assembled in Synod. That judgment has such a solemnity and obvious strength as to confound the enemies of Christ, and either to convert them, or at least to deprive them of the power of doing mischief. This is the meaning of the "pleniore judicio." In fact, St. Leo does not say "ut pleniore judicio possit veritas cognosci" or "credi," but "ut pleniore judicio possit error aboleri." He speaks evidently of the solemn judgment of the General Synod as a most efficacious means to check and destroy heresy. And in the very same Letter he authoritatively commands the Fathers of Ephesus to condemn the error of Eutyches, and not to absolve the heretic unless he made an explicit recantation of his error. If the words of the Pope are understood in the sense of Mgr. Maret and of the Gallican School, he could not have intimated these orders to the Council before having secured its unanimous consent. Moreover, in a Letter addressed about the same time to the Emperor Theodosius, he expresses himself in the clearest terms. He says that the Emperor "constituit Synodale judi-

cium ut imperito seni ea, in qua nimis caligat, veritas innotescat."[517] And in the same Letter he adds that he had fully explained in the Epistle addressed to the Patriarch Flavian "quod Catholica Ecclesia universaliter de Sacramento Dominicæ Incarnationis credat et doceat." Again, in two Letters inscribed to the Empress Pulcheria,[518] he conveys the same teaching. In another addressed to Julianus, Bishop of Cos, he speaks in the same sense as before, and openly says that he had set forth in his dogmatical Letter to Flavian what has been handed down by divine tradition, and what he would always *invariably teach.*[519] Finally, in a Letter forwarded to the Archimandrites of Constantinople, while alluding to the Synod which was to meet at Ephesus, he actually anathematises all who should follow the doctrine of Eutyches.[520] These citations are more than sufficient to prove that St. Leo regarded the Council of Ephesus as being by no means necessary to give an infallible authority to the Catholic dogma, already defined in his Letter to Patriarch Flavian.

All know what was the result of the famous Synod of Ephesus, which antiquity deservedly stigmatised with the title of Council of Robbers (*Latrocinium Ephesinum*).[521] Pope Leo, while deploring the evils of the Church and the apparent triumph of heresy in the East, by his immoveable firmness and inflexible courage, saved the Oriental Church, already on the brink of ruin,

[517] *Epist.* xxix. *ad Theodosium Imp.* (l. c., p. 840).

[518] *Epist.* xxx. et xxxi. *S. Leonis Papæ ad Pulcheriam Augustam* (l. c., p. 847, seq., p. 853, seq. In Labbe, pt. i. Act. Conc. Chalced., nn. xi., xii., pp. 791, 794).

[519] *Epist.* xxxiv. *ad Julianum Episc. Coënsem*, cap. ii. (l. c., p. 870. In Labbe, l. c., n. viii., p. 783).

[520] *Epist.* xxxii. *ad Faustum et Reliquos Archim. Constantinop.* (l. c., p. 860, seq. In Labbe, l. c., n. ix., p. 787).

[521] Liberatus, *Breviarium Hist. Nest. et Eutych.*, cap. xii. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxviii., p. 1003, seq.).

and secured the triumph of the Catholic dogma. The childish and stubborn Emperor Theodosius having confirmed with an edict the heretical decisions of Ephesus, and having refused to allow another Council to be assembled in Italy, as St. Leo requested, the Pope, after having solemnly condemned in a Roman Synod the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus, sent his dogmatical Letter all over the Church. His purpose was that all who had been induced by fear to reject its doctrine might have an opportunity of recanting, and that it might receive the signatures of all the Bishops. And it did, in fact, receive the subscriptions of the whole Episcopal body, with the exception of Dioscorus and of a few among his principal partisans; so that St. Leo had no longer any reason to be anxious for the convocation of a General Council as a means of healing the wounds of the Church; especially when Marcian and Pulcheria had taken the helm of the Empire, and by their virtues guaranteed the security and triumph of the faith.[522] But before touching on the Council of Chalcedon, which the new Emperor pressed the Pope to assemble for the sake of the Catholic faith, it is important to inquire how far the dogmatical Letter of St. Leo to Flavian was looked upon in the Church as an irreformable definition before that Council assembled. When once this point is established in the affirmative, many objections urged in the matter by the Gallican School must fall to the ground.

Now, before the Synod of Chalcedon, nearly the whole Church had signed the Letter of St. Leo. In fact, in 450, Anatolius, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, having assembled a Synod in the capital, he and all the Bishops there present signed the Letter in the

[522] *Episi.* lxxxiii. *ad Marcianum Imp.*, cap. ii. (Op., l. c., p. 1047).

presence of the Pontifical Legates.[523] But many of the Eastern Bishops having been absent, the Letter was sent to all and each of them, and it received their signatures.[524] Moreover, the Patriarch of Antioch, with all the Bishops of his Patriarchate, signed it also, as St. Leo himself says in a Letter to Paschasinus.[525] And we can surely affirm that the greatest part of the Eastern Church signed the document, for the Pope is able to inform Anatolius that all the Oriental Bishops had given it their signatures;[526] and, moreover, in the Synod of Chalcedon, when the Letter was publicly read, all the Bishops solemnly declared that they had already signed it, and that, consequently, it did not want any change or correction.[527] As to the Bishops of the Western provinces, they had already adhered to the decisions of St. Leo from the time of the first Synod held by him in Rome against Eutyches. For the rest, two documents are still preserved to us which speak most clearly upon the subject: the first regards the Church of Milan, the other concerns the Gallican Church; and both bear witness to the infallible authority of the Pope.[528] The Gallican Church drew up on this occasion an admirable confession in favour of the Papal doctrine. It speaks of the Letter of the Pope as a symbol of faith, which every Catholic would engrave in

[523] Conc. Constantinopolitanum ii., an. 450 (Labbe, t. iv., p. 751).

[524] Conc. Chalcedon., Act. iv. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1435).

[525] *Epist.* lxxxviii., cap. iii. (Op., l. c., p. 1059).

[526] *Epist. Anatolii ad Leonem Papam* (Inter S. Leonis Epist., n. xci., l. c., p. 1066). "Ipse indicare dignatus sis quod in suscipienda Catholica fide et damnatione Eutychis atque Nestorii omnes Orientales subscripserint Sacerdotes."

[527] Conc. Chalced., Act. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1207).

[528] *Epist. Eusebii Mediolanensis ad Leonem Papam* (xcvii. inter Epist. S. Leonis. Op., l. c., p. 1080, seq.); *Synodica Episc. Gall. ad Leonem Papam* (xcix. inter S. Leonis Epist. Op., l. c., p. 1107, seq.).

his mind, in order to destroy the errors of the heretics.[529] "To your doctrine," they said, "after God, the Faithful owe, that they may firmly hold what they already believed; the faithless owe also to it, that, being enlightened with the brightness of the Apostolical instruction, and having known the truth, they may withdraw from their perfidy and quit the darkness of their error, in order to follow and believe what Christ our Lord has taught through your lips on the mystery of His Incarnation." Such was the persuasion of the whole Church with regard to the dogmatical and infallible character of Leo's Letter before the Council of Chalcedon. The documents, which we have in hand, prove that the greatest part of the Church had signed the Pope's Definition. And, on the other side, no protest, no reclamation, no exception whatever is recorded; and the absence of further documents bearing other signatures does not in itself imply any kind of opposition against it. Moreover, we are informed that the Letter was communicated to all the Bishops of the Catholic Church, and the expressions of the Fathers of Chalcedon, that "all had signed it," do not allow us to admit any exception, at least of the slightest importance, unless proved by positive documents. We may, then, safely conclude that the dogmatical Letter of Pope Leo to Flavian was universally regarded as containing an infallible dogma of faith, even before the Council of Chalcedon was assembled. The Gallican School, if faithful to their principles, should not repudiate this conclusion. But Mgr. Maret, following in the steps of the *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, thinks that it cannot be said that the majority of the Bishops had signed the Letter of St. Leo; and, moreover, he maintains that the signatures which it received are due to a careful

[529] *Synodica Episc. Gall. ad Leonem Papam* (xcix. inter S. Leonis Epist. Op., cap. ii., p. 1108).

examination made by them of its doctrine.[530] But all the Oriental Bishops and those of the Roman Synod in 448, signed the Letter of the Pope; and therefore, even if the letters of the Churches of France and Milan did not arrive before the meeting at Chalcedon, we must say that the majority of the Church was then committed to St. Leo's Letter. Besides this, no one can entertain the least doubt with regard to the rest of the Western Church. If, in its whole or in any of its provinces, the West had disagreed from the sentence pronounced in Rome by its own Patriarch and Pope, we should have had at least some record of the circumstance in the Letters of St. Leo. But he never makes the most distant allusion to any dissent on their side, nor to any of his Legates being intrusted with the mission of reconciling dissentients among them. This was done for the Eastern Church alone. And yet all the Oriental Bishops signed his Letter. Thus, if we put them together with the Prelates of the West, we have a full majority of the Church standing for St. Leo's dogmatical Letter. The minority, under the influence of Dioscorus and a few other Bishops, were condemned everywhere by Provincial Synods, and were held everywhere as heretics. Mgr. Maret has, then, no ground to assert that "rien n'est plus gratuite que l'assertion intéressée des théologiens qui soutiennent que la Lettre de Saint Léon avait, avant l'ouverture du Concile de Chalcédoine, l'adhésion de l'Eglise universelle."[531] In order to substantiate his assertion, Mgr. Maret ought to prove that the faction of Dioscorus in 450 and 451 was, at least apparently, as large as the party attached to St. Leo's Letter. But all the documents of the age are against this suggestion. Again, Mgr. Maret is mistaken when he states that the Letter of St.

[530] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. v., n. vi., t. i., p. 223, seq.
[531] *Ibid.*, l. c.

Leo was signed everywhere because, after examination, it was found to conform with the doctrinal tenets of the Fathers. He argues thus on account of the examination mentioned in the Synod of Constantinople. But this proves nothing; (1.) because, in order that a Papal decision may be synodically received and signed by the Episcopal body, it must be synodically examined; not, indeed, with a view to decide whether or not it should be accepted, but in order that the adhesion of the Synod may be judicial and with full knowledge of the cause. Therefore what is mentioned in Constantinople must have taken place only at Milan, and in the Churches of Gaul, etc. (2.) Moreover, the Synod was held and the examination of the Letter was made at the request of the Pope himself, who sent his Legates for that very purpose to Constantinople.[532] St. Leo knew well that Anatolius had been promoted by Dioscorus to the patriarchal see, and that he was by no means deserving of unlimited confidence. Nevertheless the great Pope, ever firm and zealous for Catholic dogma, remained faithful to his principles of paternal charity and moderation. He remembered that he was the Vicar of Him, Who, appearing to His faithless Disciple, said—"Put in thy finger hither, and see My hands . . . and be not faithless but believing."[533] Therefore, according to the example of his Divine Master, he said to the Patriarch Anatolius—"Look at the doctrine which the Fathers of the Church have handed down concerning the mystery of the Incarnation; consider also my Letter to Flavian, which expresses the exact doctrine of the Fathers, that you may make a solemn and Catholic profession of faith."[534] We have here a proof

[532] *Epist.* lxix. *ad Theodosium*, cap. iii. (Op. l. c., p. 1007); *Epist.* lxx. *ad Pulcheriam Aug.* (l. c., p. 1010, seq.).

[533] Joan. xx. 27.

[534] *Epist.* lxix. *ad Theodosium*, cap. i. (l. c., p. 1006).

only of that spirit of charity and Christian condescension with which the heart of the holy Pontiff was animated. But (3.) in his charitable condescension towards one of his weak brethren, he did not forget his Pontifical infallible authority. Therefore, in his Letter to the Emperor Theodosius he firmly declared that, unless Anatolius made and signed a public and sincere profession of faith according to the doctrine of the dogmatic Letter and of the whole Catholic Church, his election could not receive the Papal confirmation.[535] And in another Letter to the Empress Pulcheria he authoritatively states that, had Anatolius rejected the confession proposed in his dogmatical Letter, he must know that he, like any other criminal, would be cast out and cut off from Catholic unity.[536]

Mgr. Maret appeals to the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon as a sure test to decide the question whether or not St. Leo's Letter was an absolute rule of faith before the Decree of the Synod.[537] But he does not see that the best argument for our affirmative answer is drawn from these very Acts of the Council. Pope Leo, clearly, consented to the new Synod only upon the condition that no one should be allowed to inquire which doctrine was to be followed, as if this were still uncertain.[538] And in his Letter to the Synod of Chalcedon, he intimated that the dogma of the Incarnation,

[535] Epist. cit. "Ita ut sinceram communis fidei professionem, absolutissima subscriptione, coram omni clero et universa plebe declaret, Apostolicæ Sedi et universis Domini Sacerdotibus atque Ecclesiis publicandam," etc.

[536] *Epist.* lxx. *ad Pulcheriam* (l. c., p. 1010). "Quam (confessionem) si quis existimaverit non sequendam, ipse se a compage Catholicæ unitatis abscidit."

[537] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. v., n. vi., t. i., p. 225.

[538] *Epist.* lxxxii. *ad Marcianum Imp.*, cap. i. (Op., t. i., p. 1044). "Ne cujusquam procaci impudentique versutia quasi de incerto quid sequendum sit sinatis inquiri."

as set forth in his Letter to Flavian, must no longer be treated as an open question.[539] Nor did the Fathers of Chalcedon take a different view. When, in the Second Session, the imperial officers and the Senate exhorted the Bishops to settle the controversy of faith, that the dissidents might be called back to concord and unity, they answered unanimously that no one could make another exposition of faith, nor even attempt to do so. And Cecropius, Bishop of Sebastopolis, speaking in the name of the Council, said that Pope Leo had already given the form of the Catholic doctrine, that they followed him, and had already signed his Letter. And the rest of the Bishops, in order to show that they agreed with Cecropius, exclaimed unanimously—"We all say the same. What has been said suffices; it is unlawful to make any other exposition."[540] When the judges insisted on their own view, they received the same answer from the whole Council—"We do not wish to write a new exposition. The rule forbids us to make any other exposition." "We who signed the Letter of Pope Leo desire no change whatever." "The faith has been examined and confirmed by the Fathers of Nicæa and of Ephesus, and recently by the most

[539] *Epist.* xciii. *ad Conc. Chalced.*, cap. ii. (Op., t. i., p. 1071). "Unde, fratres carissimi, rejecta penitus audacia disputandi contra Fidem divinitus inspiratam, vana errantium infidelitas conquiescat; nec liceat defendi quod non licet credi, cum secundum evangelicas auctoritates, secundum propheticas voces, apostolicamque doctrinam plenissime et lucidissime per litteras quas ad beatæ memoriæ Flavianum episcopum misimus, fuerit declaratum quæ sit de Sacramento Incarnationis D. N. J. C. pia et sincera confessio."

[540] Conc. Chalced., Act. ii. (Labbe, t. iv., pp. 1206—7). "Emerserunt quæ ad Eutychetem pertinebant, et super iis forma data est a Sanctissimo Archiepiscopo Romanæ urbis, et sequimur eum, et epistolæ omnes subscripsimus. Reverendissimi Episcopi clamaverunt: Ita omnes dicimus: sufficiunt quæ exposita sunt: alteram expositionem non licet fieri."

holy Pope Leo."[541] Then Cecropius himself proposed that the decisions of Nicæa, of Ephesus, and of St. Leo should be read in the Council. The Judges consented. The Letter of Pope Leo was received with the most marked respect, and with cries of anathema to those who refuse to believe in it.[542] And although some Bishops of Palestine and of Illyria applied for explanation of some expressions in the Letter, which was fully afforded to them, the whole of the Council, when asked by the imperial officers, answered in the most explicit and uniform manner that "no one of them felt any doubt,"[543] because "Peter had spoken by the lips of Leo."[544]

Just then, however, the Bishop of Nicopolis asked on behalf of the Bishops of Illyria a delay of five days before signing St. Leo's Letter. The Judges of the Synod granted the request, but the majority of the Council protested against it, saying that they all had already put their signatures to the Epistle of the Pope.[545] Nevertheless, the Judges and the Senate replied that in order, as was suitable (ἀκόλουθόν ἐστι), to persuade and instruct the doubters, Anatolius should appoint some persons whom he believed fit to teach such as had any scruples.[546] The Bishops of Illyria numbered only thirty-two in the Council, and adding to them those of Palestine who felt some difficulties, the total number of those who were not without doubt as to

[541] Conc. Chalced., Act ii. (l. c.). "In scriptis expositionem non facimus. Regula est quæ prædicat sufficere quæ sunt exposita. Regula vult aliam expositionem non fieri," etc.

[542] *Ibid.*, p. 1235, seq.

[543] *Ibid.*, p. 1238.

[544] *Ibid.* "Petrus per Leonem ita locutus est."

[545] *Ibid.*, p. 1239. "Omnes Reverendissimi Episcopi clamaverunt: Nos ita credimus; nostrûm nullus dubitat; nos jam subscripsimus."

[546] *Ibid.*, Act ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1239); Act iv. (Labbe, p. 1359).

some expressions of St. Leo's Letter would amount to no more than forty-eight: a very small minority.[547] On the other hand, the Fathers who had already signed the Letter, and who regarded it as irreformable, formed in the Council a majority of 582.[548] Now on these facts, which are stated from authentic Acts of the Council, we make the following remarks, which are of much importance in our subject. (1.) The larger part of the Synod had signed St. Leo's Letter, and they maintained that it was not liable to any change whatever; and accordingly they appealed to the ecclesiastical rule by which it was forbidden to change or correct what had been set forth by St. Leo. But the ecclesiastical rule does not forbid the reformation of doctrinal expositions which are not infallible, and which consequently may admit of reformation. It follows, then, that the Bishops regarded St. Leo's Letter as infallible and irreformable. (2.) In fact, they put this Letter on the same level with the Symbol of Nicæa, and with two of the Letters of St. Cyril approved by the Synod of Ephesus, treating these documents as the very foundations of the dogma of Incarnation definitively explained and confirmed in the Church. (3.) The large majority of the Council, 582 Bishops out of 630, constantly refused to subject St. Leo's Letter to any examination, notwithstanding the pressing requests of the imperial officers and of the Senate. Nevertheless, the officers, who were laymen, persisted in their request, only in order to gain over the few Bishops of Illyria and Palestine who still entertained some doubt as to some expressions of the

[547] The Illyrian Bishops declared in the Fourth Session that the Papal Legates had explained some difficulties of language with which they had met in St. Leo's Letter. The like declaration was given by the Bishops of Palestine. *Vide* Act. iv., l. c., pp. 1382, 1383.

[548] See Act. iv., l. c.

Letter. Therefore the review of the Letter was granted only for these, as an indulgence to their weakness; they were to be led to understand the true meaning of that dogmatic document by those who were fully acquainted with it.[549] Consequently, properly speaking, what is called by the Gallican School the re-examination of St. Leo's Letter, was nothing more than an instruction and explanation granted to the ignorance of a very small minority, which the Synod wished rather to gain over than to condemn. This being so, all that is said by Mgr. Maret and by the Gallicans in general, falls to nothing. Mgr. Maret asserts that "la Lettre de Saint Léon, quoiqu'elle fût un jugement dogmatique et solennel du Siége Apostolique, n'était pas regardée par le Concile, au commencement de sa quatrième Session, comme une règle absolue de foi." He adds—"Qu'elle l'était devenue avant la fin de cette même Session."[550]

He rests his first assertion (which he represents as certain) upon the fact of the examination of the Letter. We have seen what value should be set on this argument. He grounds the other assertion on the incident that when, at the end of the Fourth Session, the ten Bishops of Egypt refused to sign St. Leo's Letter, because their new Patriarch had not yet been appointed, the Synod declared that whoever should refuse to sign the Letter which all the Council had signed, would be a heretic.[551] But we have seen that when the Letter was read in the Second Session, the whole Synod exclaimed, that all the orthodox believed thus, and they pronounced anathema against all who would not profess the same faith. Moreover, we have shown that in order to secure Catholic unity in those who were somewhat doubtful about the meaning of St. Leo's Letter, it was

[549] Conc. Chalced., Act. iv. (l. c., p. 1360).
[550] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. v., n. vii., t. i., p. 234.
[551] Act. iv. (l. c., p. 1402, seq.).

allowed to them, as a great indulgence, to reconsider it and receive full explanation of it. After this, and when the whole Council had solemnly given its adhesion to St. Leo's exposition, no further indulgence could be granted; but those who had in any matter opposed the dogmatic Letter were to be left to bear the consequences of their unjust resistance.

Mgr. Maret founds a further objection upon the manner in which the Fathers of Chalcedon signed the Letter of St. Leo: they declare it, he says, conformable to the Decrees of the two preceding Councils; and they give this reason for their signing it. This objection, which of course is originally in the *Def. Decl. Cler. Gall.*,[552] had already been abundantly answered by Orsi,[553] by Muzzarelli,[554] and others, whom Mgr. Maret should have carefully read and examined when he undertook the task of refuting them. We will give the answer. It has often been remarked, that the general practice of the Church in enacting a Decree of faith, is to declare the doctrine to be in agreement with the doctrine laid down by the Fathers and the Ecumenical Councils; and therefore when the irreformable character of a Canon of faith sanctioned by a General Synod is spoken of, this reason is alleged, and not the infallibility of the Assembly by which it was decreed. In proof of this, it will be enough to refer to the answer which many Bishops, scattered over all parts of the Church, gave to the Emperor Leo, when consulted by him as to the irreformability of the doctrines sanctioned in the Synod of Chalcedon. They did not say that the Synod was infallible, and that for

[552] *Du Concile Général*, l. c., p. 236; *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gall.*, pt. ii., l. xii., cap. xvii., p. 175.

[553] *De R. Pontificis Auctoritate*, l. i., cap. xvii., art. ii., p. 124, seq.

[554] *De Auct. R. Pontificis in Conc. Gen.*, cap. viii., sec. vi., t. ii., p. 102, seq.

this reason its Decrees could not admit of reformation; they said only that the Council had not imposed any doctrine, beyond that defined at Nicæa, and confirmed by the following Councils.[555] In like manner, the Fathers of Chalcedon did not intend to deny the infallibility of St. Leo's Letter, even though they declared that they had signed it on account of its being conformable to the faith of Nicæa and of Ephesus.

This conclusion is strengthened by considering the final definition of the Synod of Chalcedon. The course taken by the Synod was first to read the Symbols of Nicæa and of Constantinople; afterwards it was remarked that although the Nicæan Symbol ought alone to be sufficient to support Catholic truth, yet in order to counteract all the artifices of the heretics, the Council confirmed the Symbol of Constantinople, the Epistles of St. Cyril, and that of St. Leo to the Patriarch Flavian; and using the very words of St. Leo, it set forth the doctrine of the two Natures in Christ.[556] It will now be clear that the confirmation given by the Council to the Letter of St. Leo means nothing different from what we have repeatedly inculcated on the subject of Ecumenical Councils; that is to say, a true judicial adhesion of the Synod to the infallible dogmatical Decree of the Roman Pontiff. Otherwise the Synod would not have confirmed St. Leo's Letter in the same terms as it employed in confirming the Symbols of Nicæa and Constantinople. If the synodical confirmation conferred an infallible character to the Pope's Letter, we should be forced to conclude that it conferred

[555] *Epist. Anatolii ad Leonem Aug.* (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1853); *Epist. Episc. Osroenæ ad Leonem Aug.* (l. c., p. 1866); *Epist. Epp. Phoeniciæ Maritimæ ad Leonem Aug.* (l. c., p. 1869); *Epist. Episc. Prov. Isauriæ ad eundem* (l. c., p. 1874, seq.); *Epist. Epp. Ciliciæ Primæ ad eundem* (i. c., p. 1876); etc.

[556] Conc. Chalced., Act. v. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1451—1462).

the same character to the infallible Symbols of Nicæa and Constantinople. No, the confirmation of the Synod could not add fresh strength to the definition, which, in the words of St. Leo, God Himself had pronounced through the ministry of His Vicar. The Bishops, by adhering to the sentence pronounced by the Pope, manifestly proved themselves to be true members in perfect concord with their Head; and by this accord new evidence was afforded that the sentence issued from the Pontifical Chair had come from God Himself.[557] The language of the Fathers of Chalcedon in their final relation to Pope Leo reaffirms what we here state.[558]

Let this then suffice. The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, far from shaking the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, place it in a new and clearer light; and this our conviction is in no way shaken by the remarks of Mgr. Maret.[559]

We will pass over the Acacian controversy and schism which terminated with the Synod of Constantinople, where Pope Hormisdas imposed on the Oriental Church the famous formula of faith which—as we mentioned in our fifth section—was universally signed by the Eastern as well as by the Western Church; and

[557] *Epist.* cxx. *S. Leoni Papæ ad Theodoretum Episc.*, cap. i. (Op., t. i., p. 1219). "Quæ nostro prius ministerio definierat (Dominus) universæ fraternitatis irretractabili firmavit assensu, ut vere a se prodiisse ostenderet, quod prius a prima omnium Sede formatum, totius Christiani orbis judicium recepisset, ut in hoc quoque capiti membra concordent."

[558] *Relatio S. Synodis Chalced. ad Leonem Papam* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1774). πᾶσι τῆς τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου φωνῆς ἑρμηνεὺς καθιστάμενος, etc. (l. c., p. 1776). St. Peter Chrysologus had held the same language in a letter addressed to Eutyches (Inter *Epist. S. Leonis*, Epist. xxv., cap. ii. Op. S. Leonis, t. i., p. 779).

[559] Mgr. Maret says, "Nous ne craignons pas de dire que s'il en était ainsi, la conduite du Concile de Chalcédoine serait entièrement inexplicable" (l. ii., ch. v., n. vi., p. 223).

which was everywhere regarded as the distinctive mark of orthodoxy. In that formula the infallibility of the Roman Chair is stated with perfect plainness. Pope Hormisdas not only mentions in it the fact of the Roman See having always been preserved immaculate from error and heresy, but alleges also the Divine promises on which that fact is grounded, and from which it originates. On account of the infallibility of the Apostolic See, the Bishops of the whole world solemnly promised to follow in everything that Chair, and to profess without any exception or reserve whatever came with its authority.[560] The Bishops of the East were bound to bear in mind the guiding principle of that formula at the time of the famous controversy of the Three Chapters, on account of which the Fifth Ecumenical Council was summoned in Constantinople.

By the Three Chapters (*Tria Capitula*) were meant the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the letter of Theodoret against the anathemas of St. Cyril, and that of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, to the Persian Maris. The Council of Chalcedon had abstained from condemning these writings or their authors, for it seemed better to leave them in oblivion, rather than to draw them into notice throughout the Catholic world by a dogmatical censure. But the Eutychians wished to bring about their condemnation as an act of revenge against the Council of Chalcedon. On the other side, the Nestorians attributed a high degree of authority to these writings, and thus sheltered their errors, alleging as reason that they had not been reprobated by the Council of Chalcedon. Therefore the Emperor Justinian, following those despotical principles which led him to claim the power to legislate in theological controversies, published an edict by which he condemned the Three

[560] See the formula in Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, n. xx., p. 49, seq. Edition of 1863.

Chapters; and he urged upon the Eastern Bishops to sign this condemnation.[561] But he knew well that no edict on ecclesiastical matters could be forced upon the Church so long as the Sovereign Pontiff withheld his consent. In the hope of obtaining this sanction, he invited Pope Vigilius to Constantinople, intending if necessary to use force to procure the Papal confirmation of his edict, which had been already received by a great part of the Patriarchs and Bishops of the Oriental Church.

Pope Vigilius and the Latin Bishops felt great reluctance in joining in the condemnation of writings which the Council of Chalcedon had spared, and far more of persons who had closed their life in communion with the Church. Nor would the Pope have consented to leave Rome for Constantinople; but he was seized and forcibly obliged to undertake the journey.[562] While he was on his way, it came to his knowledge that the Bishops of the East had been compelled by violence to sign the imperial edict, and he thought himself bound to resist the encroachment of the civil power in an ecclesiastical matter which had not been carefully examined by the competent authority. He therefore wrote a Letter to the Patriarch Mennas, blaming the condemnation of the Three Chapters; and at the same time he sent Legates to the Emperor, entreating him to withdraw his edict.[563] This act of Pope Vigilius was followed successively, after his arrival at Constantinople, by the *Judicatum*, the *Constitutum*, and the *Decretum*, with which he finally confirmed the Decrees of the Fifth Ecumenical Synod. Before we proceed to examine

[561] Facundus Hermianensis, *Defensio Trium Capitulorum*, l. ii., cap. iii.; l. iv., cap. iv. (Gallandi, t. xi., p. 682, seq., p. 707, seq.).

[562] Hefele, *Hist. des Conciles*, l. xiv., ch. i., sec. 258, t. iii., p. 425.

[563] Facundus Herm., Op. cit., l. iv., cap. iii. (Gallandi, t. xi., p. 708).

these much-vexed documents in detail, it will be necessary to give a clear statement of the true nature of the controversy. Mgr. Maret founds on the case of Pope Vigilius an elaborate and, as he seems to suppose, an invincible argument against Papal Infallibility; but the argument derives all its importance and force from a simple misunderstanding of the question that was at issue;[564] and the writer proves himself alike forgetful of Church history and of the views taken by his predecessors in the School to which he belongs.

The controversy of the Three Chapters did not in any way concern a dogma of faith. It related only to a question of mere ecclesiastical economy and prudence. First, the Pope himself bears witness to this in his Decree of confirmation of the Fifth Synod,[565] as well as in his Letter of condemnation of Theodore of Cæsarea.[566] The words used by Vigilius will be found in the note. Moreover, the Italian Clergy, in their address to the legation sent from France, testify the same.[567]

[564] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. vii., t. i., p. 247, seq.

[565] *Epist. Decretalis pro confirmatione Synodi Quintæ* (Labbe, t. vi., p. 239). "In una eademque quatuor illarum Synodorum fide sincere persistentes, cavillationibus, versutiis et dolo malo ab iis (fratribus) dividere conatus fuerit (diabolus); ita ut nosmetipsi qui ejusdem cum illis eramus et sumus de fide sententiæ, insuper habita dilectione fraterna in discordiam abierimus."

[566] *Fragmentum Damnationis Theodori Episc. Cæsareæ* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1315). "Primum quidem in eo quod pro scandalo refrænando condescendentes quorumdam animis, quos aliqua dispensatione credimus temperandos, quia tu jam eos pluribus annis inquietissimus stimulator accenderas, quædam pro tempore existimavimus ordinanda, tali scilicet conditione, ut, omni in posterum perturbatione sopita, nihil ultra nec verbo nec litteris, quisquam facere ex eadem causa præsumeret."

[567] *Epist. Legatis Francorum ab Italiæ Clericis directa* (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxix, p. 115). "Postea tamen tractatu habito prædictus S. Papa Vigilius sub aliqua dispensatione ipsam causam ordinavit," etc.

And again, the documents themselves, and all the circumstances of the affair in its different stages, tell so strongly in favour of this view, that it is upheld by such writers as De Marca in his Dissertation on the subject,[568] by Tournely,[569] and in our days by Dr. Döllinger.[570] But besides these evidences, we may also, in support of what we say, quote the authority of two Popes, Pelagius I. and St. Gregory the Great. The former, speaking of this controversy, pointedly asserts that "quædam capitula *extra fidem* agitata fuerunt."[571] St. Gregory, in a Letter addressed to all the Bishops of the Church, solemnly declares that in the Fifth Synod nothing was treated concerning faith, but "de quibusdam solummodo

[568] "Qui rerum ecclesiasticarum sunt periti non ignorant duobus modis olim versari solitos fuisse summos pontifices in quæstionibus propositis, quæ disciplinam respiciebant, vel summo jure, vel remisso. Huic temperamento et canonum remissioni locus erat quando ob bonum unitatis, et pro resarcienda Ecclesiæ pace, necessarium videbatur ea clementia uti. Eam clementiam Græci οἰκονομίαν vocant. Latini eorum exemplo dispensationem. . . . Utroque agendi modo usus est in hac controversia Vigilius, nunc juris et canonum vigore, nunc eorum remissione, fidei et pacis Ecclesiam studiosissimum se præbens. Observatum quidem est ab eruditis, Vigilii quæ videbatur inconstantiam, prudentiæ et maturo consilio esse tribuendam sed non docuerunt eum agendi modum a canonica disciplina pependisse" (*De Vigilii Decret. Epist. pro Conf. Syn.* v., *Diss. P. De Marca*, n. vi. In Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxix., p. 130). We recommend these words, and all the Dissertation of De Marca, to the study of Mgr. Maret.

[569] Tournely, *De Eccles.*, t. ii., q. v., a. 3, p. 187. Edit. Parisiis, 1739. In this place the author adopts the words of De Marca, who says that "Ab eo (Vigilio) summa prudentia factum est, ut ostenderet eam esse controversiæ conditionem, quæ in utramque partem inflecti posset, si paci Ecclesiæ hac ratione consuleretur."

[570] *History of the Church*, pt. ii., ch. iv., sec. v., vol. ii., p. 187. London, 1840.

[571] *Epist. Pelagii I. ad Childebertum Regem* (Labbe, t. vi., p. 474).

personis actitatum."[572] And these words of St. Gregory agree perfectly with what his predecessor Pelagius II. wrote to the Bishops of Istria.[573] This being established, we may proceed to consider the Decrees put forth by Pope Vigilius after his arrival in the imperial city of the East.

It was clearly impossible for the Pope to sanction a decree issued by a civil ruler in an ecclesiastical matter which had been, or was thought to have been, prejudged by the sentence of an Ecumenical Council. Vigilius was therefore right in punishing the Bishops who in so weighty a question had not applied for advice to the Apostolic See, and had put their signature to an edict of this character. But since the Oriental Bishops were persuaded that the interest of the Church required the condemnation of the Three Chapters, Vigilius undertook the examination of the whole controversy in a Synod of seventy Bishops, and thereupon he published his *Judicatum*, condemning the writings of Theodore, the letter of Theodoret, and that of Ibas; but he expressly forbade any one to impugn the authority of the Council of Chalcedon.[574] It is beyond controversy that the Three Chapters were in themselves worthy of condemnation, and no part of them could consistently be defended by any who professed submission to the Decrees of Ephesus; for they are occupied either with assertion of Nestorian doctrine which was condemned

[572] *Epist.*, l. x., *Epist.* li. *ad Univ. Episc.* (Op., t. i., p. 615. Edit. Maur.).

[573] *Epist. Pelagii II. ad Episc. Istriæ*, cap. iii., seq. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 474, seq.).

[574] The text of the *Judicatum* of Vigilius is lost. A fragment of it was preserved in a letter of Justinian to the Fifth Synod (In Coll. i., Conc. v. Labbe, t. vi., p. 23). Dr. Hefele thinks that he sees five other fragments of the *Judicatum* in the *Constitutum* of Pope Vigilius (*Hist. des Conciles*, l. xiv., ch. i., sec. 259, t. iii., p. 433, seq.).

by the Council, or with attacks on the anathemas of St. Cyril which received the approval of that Assembly. The question which Vigilius was called upon to decide, concerned the opportuneness of formally condemning these writings, and it involved the respect due to the Council of Chalcedon, which, while it had recognised the present orthodoxy of Theodoret and Ibas, had passed in silence over the writings of the former—which seemed to favour the Nestorian views—yet allowed the letter of Ibas to be read in a public Assembly. When the matter was discussed in the Synod held by Pope Vigilius, it was seen that the whole conduct of the Council of Chalcedon in respect of these writings ought to be referred to a prudent economy; and that now the new circumstances in which the Church was placed suggested a different manner of dealing with the doubtful documents, and afforded reason for their condemnation. The *Judicatum* of Pope Vigilius rests on these grounds, and it is a monument of the prudence which governed the Pontiff's conduct.

But the greater part of the Western Bishops did not take the same view of the seventy Oriental Prelates who advised Pope Vigilius. The Church was threatened with a schism. In such a case, the principles of ecclesiastical prudence suggest a suspension or even a change of a disciplinary law, which, if upheld with rigour, might fill the Church with confusion. On this account, Pope Vigilius, faithful to his maxims of peace and charity, resolved to recall his *Judicdtum*, and to refer the whole affair to the examination of a General Council to be composed of Eastern and Western Bishops; but in the meantime he forbade the agitation of any controversy on the subject.[575] The Emperor Justinian tried every means to force him to pronounce his definitive sentence in the matter without waiting for the Bishops

[575] *Epist. Cleri Italiæ* (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxix., p. 115).

of the West. But when the Emperor understood that his threats and his cruel treatment were powerless to break the firmness of the Pontiff, he published in 521 a new edict against the Three Chapters, and ordered it to be signed by the Bishops.[576] But Vigilius again threatened to anathematise all who should adhere to the imperial edict; and he actually deposed Theodore of Cæsarea, and suspended Mennas with his suffragan Bishops.[577]

The unshaken constancy of the Pope caused the Emperor to withdraw his edict, and led even his enemies to give marks of repentance and submission. Mennas and other Bishops addressed to him their profession of faith, declaring that they received not only the four General Councils, but also all the Letters and Decrees of the Popes concerning faith, rejecting whatever had been published against the Three Chapters, and applying to the Pope for pardon for their share in the cruel treatment which he had received at the hands of the imperial officials.[578] Eutychius also, the successor of Mennas, sent to the Pope his profession of faith, and begged him to allow the controversy of the Three Chapters to be treated in a General Council.[579] Vigilius approved his proposal, upon the conditions already agreed upon with the Emperor.[580] But Justinian summoned the Synod for

[576] *Epist. Cleri Italiæ*, l. c., *Confessio Rectæ Fidei Imp. Justiniani adv. Tria Capitula* (Labbe, t. vi., p. 358, seq.).

[577] See his *Epist. of condemnation of Theodorus* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1316).

[578] See *Prof. Fidei Mennæ aliorumque Episcoporum* in the *Constitutum* of Pope Vigilius (Labbe, t. v., p. 1317, seq.). See also *Epist. Cleri Italiæ*, cit., pp. 116, 117. Edit. cit.

[579] *Epist. Eutychii Patr. ad Vigilium Papam.* In Coll. i., Conc. Constantinop. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 26, seq.).

[580] *Epist. Vigilii Papæ ad Eutychium.* In Coll. i., Conc. Constantinop. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 30, seq.).

Constantinople, and not for any place in Italy, as the Pope had desired; and, more than this, he did not even await the arrival of the Western Bishops, nor did he encourage them to come. He went so far as to address a letter to the Synod, renewing his instances for the condemnation of the Three Chapters, instead of leaving the Bishops free to take their own determination after a due examination of the controversy.[581] Having regard to what passed, we cannot be surprised that Pope Vigilius refused to preside over this Council, nor that he ignored its existence. The conduct of the Pontiff was not the result of any want of steadiness and prudence, but was a consequence of the illegality of all the proceedings adopted by the Emperor.

But several parties of Bishops, under their own Patriarchs, visited the Pope and entreated him to join them and to sanction the synodical proceedings, and to pronounce his sentence in the matter. By this importunity he was induced to promise the Emperor that he would carefully examine the whole controversy, and communicate to him his final resolutions. The fact is that, after a short delay, on account of the weak state of his health, he forwarded to the Emperor his famous *Constitutum*, signed by nineteen Bishops.[582] In this document he condemns sixty propositions extracted from the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, pointing out the part of Catholic doctrine which each of them contradicted. But he abstains from anathematising their author, on account of deference due to St. Cyril and to the two Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, who kept

[581] See *Constitutum Vigilii Papæ* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1320); *Epist. Justiniani Imp. ad Episcopos Constantinop. degentes.* In Coll. i., Conc. Const. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 20, seq.).

[582] *Constitutum Vigilii Papæ de Tribus Capitulis* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1317, seq. In Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxix., p. 67, seq.).

silence on the personal question, although they had distinctly condemned the doctrine of Theodore. As to Theodoret, Vigilius condemned the propositions favourable to Nestorianism which were implied or contained in the writings attributed to him; but since he had solemnly anathematised Nestorius and his errors, and signed the Letter of Pope Leo and the Canons of Chalcedon, the Pontiff did not think proper to condemn the writings of a venerable Bishop and cast a slur on his glorious name, especially after the example of moderation set by the great Cyril and the Synod of Chalcedon.[583] With regard to the letter of Ibas, Pope Vigilius produced extracts from the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, showing that the Papal Legates, as well as Anatolius of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch, had expressed themselves favourably as to the orthodoxy of the document. But the Pontiff acknowledges that, although the epistle of Ibas had been judged orthodox by the Fathers of Chalcedon, "illa quæ in ipsa Ibæ Sacerdotis Epistola in injuriis beatæ recordationis Cyrilli per errorem intelligentiæ dicta sunt, Patres in Sancta Chalcedonensi Synodo, epistolam pronuntiantes orthodoxam, nullatenus receperunt."[584] And he assigns the reason that Ibas himself fully rejected and refuted what at first he had asserted by mistake; as is evident from the Acts of the Council itself.[585] Thereupon Vigilius concluded that, following in the steps of the Synod of Chalcedon, he would not condemn either the name of Ibas or his letter, especially considering his great sufferings in the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus for the

[583] *Constitutum Vigilii Papæ de Tribus Capitulis* (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1321—1349. In Migne, l. c., pp. 72—102).

[584] *Ibid.* (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1350, 1351. In Migne, l. c., pp. 102—104).

[585] *Ibid.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1352. In Migne, l. c., p. 106).

defence of the true faith.[586] He then goes on to order that no one should pronounce any judgment on the subject in opposition to what was contained in his *Constitutum.*

We will now make a brief examination of the remarks of Mgr. Maret on the *Constitutum* of Pope Vigilius, which the French Prelate regards as the corner-stone of all his system. He asserts, first, that Pope Vigilius "par une erreur de fait, déclare que la lettre d' Ibas a été approuvée par le Concile de Chalcédoine; et, prenant par ce nouveau jugement la responsabilité de cette lettre, tolérant les expressions et les propositions qu'elle contient, et qui furent si sévèrement qualifiées par le Concile (V.) . . . il ordonne et décrète que la prétendue décision demeure en son entier, etc."[587] Secondly, he thinks that the Decree of Vigilius bears on matters of faith and on dogmatic facts, and that, nevertheless, the Pope, by a solemn and irreversible judgment *ex cathedrâ*, pronounced the letter of Ibas to be orthodox, while a General Council shortly after condemned the same letter as impious and heretical.[588] Thirdly, he maintains that the Council entirely disregarded the *Constitutum* of Vigilius; that, in a solemn Decree of faith, and on a point of faith, it contradicted the decision of the Pope, and that the Pope withdrew and annulled his own judgment in order to confirm that of the Council.[589] From all this he concludes that the Pope yielded to the opinion of the majority. Consequently, he argues that

[586] *Constitutum Vigilii Papæ de Tribus Capitulis* (l. c.). "In quibus enim dicendo male culpare visus est beatissimum Cyrillum, in postremis recte confessus, illa quæ culpaverat, refutavit." They are the words of Juvenal in the Council of Chalcedon.

[587] *Ibid.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1353. In Migne, l. c., p. 107).

[588] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. vii., n. iv., t. i., p. 257, seq.

[589] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

the Papal Infallibility depends upon the Pontiff adhering to the majority of the Bishops.[590] Dr. Pusey has recently adopted the same conclusions as Mgr. Maret, and neither of these writers differs materially from Bossuet,[591] who adopted his views without weighing the documents on which they are alleged to be grounded. Dr. Pusey has been, doubtless, led away by the authority of the great French orator.[592] As to Mgr. Maret, he has fallen into many mistakes. First, it is false that Pope Vigilius approved as orthodox the whole epistle of Ibas, including those passages which contradicted the doctrine of Ephesus. We have already given clear proof of this. Pope Vigilius did not admit the orthodoxy of any part of the epistle of Ibas except what he thought the Council itself had received; what the Council repudiated and condemned the Pope did not approve. But, since the Synod of Chalcedon did not condemn the whole letter, but only certain phrases stained with Nestorianism, Pope Vigilius, on the same ground, would not venture to condemn it. Nor would the Fifth Synod have done so had it not taken into consideration the very phrases which Vigilius and the Council of Chalcedon had totally rejected. Consequently, as to the matter of faith pointed out by Mgr. Maret, there is not the slightest difference between the Fifth Council and Pope Vigilius: both condemned what the Synod of Chalcedon in no way approved. The notion, therefore, that Pope Vigilius took on himself the responsibility of the letter, and tolerated expressions and propositions, which the Fifth Council condemned as heretical, is simply an offspring of the fancy of

[590] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. vii., n. iv., t. i., p. 269.

[591] *Def. Decl. Cleri Gall.*, pt. ii., l. xii., capp. xix., xii., t. ii., p. 180, seq.

[592] *Eirenicon*, pt. iii., *Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?* p. 268, seq. London. 1870.

Mgr. Maret. It follows that Vigilius did not profess one faith in his *Judicatum*, and another in his *Constitutum*. The same errors against faith are condemned in both documents. The difference between them bears only on the point of economy; and we may add also, that in the *Constitutum*, Pope Vigilius made an historical mistake, representing that to be a sentence of the Council of Chalcedon which was in fact merely the judgment of some few Bishops concerning Ibas and his letter. Now Vigilius knew well that the reason for which the Western Bishops objected to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, was the misgiving they had whether this condemnation was not sought as an instrument to bring disgrace on the Council of Chalcedon. On this account, and in order to quiet their alarm, he endeavoured in every way to be faithful to the plan of prudent action which the Fourth Synod followed with regard to the condemnation of the Three Chapters. His change concerned only a point of economy, and appeared to him calculated to prevent a schism, and to give peace to the Church.

Now, was Vigilius in his *Constitutum* speaking *ex cathedrâ?* Mgr. Maret maintains the affirmative. But no judgment can be *ex cathedrâ* which has for its whole purpose a point of ecclesiastical economy. Again, the Pope did not address his *Constitutum* to the Universal Church, but to the Emperor alone, nor did he declare such as refused to adopt the same belief to be separate from his communion. It follows that he did not define anything *ex cathedrâ*. De Marca,[593] Thomassin,[594] and Tournely,[595] all of whom are Gallican writers, absolutely deny, for the above reasons, that Vigilius uttered on that

[593] Dissert. cit., n. xi. (In Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. lxix., p. 133).

[594] *Dissert.* xix. *in Quintam Synodum*, n. vi., p. 398. In *Diss. in Concilia.* Edit. Lucæ, 1728.

[595] *De Eccl. Christi*, quæst. v., art. iii., t. ii., p. 188. Parisiis, 1739.

occasion a definition *ex cathedrâ.*[596] And both De Marca and Thomassin remark that Pope Vigilius prudently abstained from anathematising those who should refuse to adopt his view, because he knew that the matter itself and the particular form in which it was put, were both liable to change and reformation.[597]

Moreover, there is no ground for the assertion of Mgr. Maret as to the *Constitutum* of Vigilius being officially communicated to the Council.[598] In fact, had this been done, so important an event would certainly have been noticed in the Acts of the Synod. Moreover, Constantine, the Questor of the Imperial Palace, while communicating to the Council several documents concerning Vigilius, which bore on the condemnation of the Three Chapters, made no mention of the *Constitutum.*[599] From which it appears that Justinian, who had been so anxious for the condemnation of those writings, purposely concealed this document, which would have troubled the Synod and impeded their final decision. But he knew well that the Fathers expected the judgment of the Supreme Pastor before engaging themselves in a final resolution; particularly because Vigilius himself, before writing his *Constitutum,* had sent the Deacon Pelagius to warn the Synod that no sentence should be passed upon the Three Chapters before they had

[596] If this view on the *Constitutum* of Vigilius is taken even by Gallican theologians, we may be sure that the same is adopted by theologians of the opposite School. See, for an instance, Card. Orsi, *De Auctoritate R. Pontificis,* l. i., cap. xx., art. iii., t. i., pt. i., p. 166, seq. Rome, 1771.

[597] In l. c.

[598] We know that Baronius held this mistaken opinion. But it has no foundation whatever; and Baronius was refuted by Pagi (*Crit. in Baronium,* an. 553, n. xv., seq., t. ii., p. 609. Antwerpiæ), De Marca (Diss. cit., l. c., p. 133, seq.), and Orsi (Op. cit., l. c., art. ii., p. 163, seq.).

[599] Conc. Constantin. ii., Act. viii. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 178, seq.).

received the judgment of the Apostolic See.[600] This shows us why the Emperor sent to the Synod a collection of documents sufficient to prove to the Fathers that the Pope had condemned the Three Chapters. And he remarked by the mouth of his Questor, that they, hearing these documents, would become still more determined to enact their final Decree of condemnation.[601] Now it is incredible that the *Constitutum* would render the Fathers more determined to condemn the epistles of Theodoret and Ibas. We must therefore conclude that this document was not among those communicated to the Council.

Consequently we see the baselessness of the assertion made by Mgr. Maret, that the Synod passed over this Act of Vigilius as if it had no existence, and pronounced their own sentence, although it was different from that of the Pope. Rather we may draw the opposite conclusion, and confirm the view to which general considerations have already conducted us as to the real character of an Ecumenical Council. We say then, that the Fifth Synod professed adherence in principle as well as in fact to the judgments of the Apostolic See, although its Decree did not properly regard doctrines of faith. It was a guiding maxim of ecclesiastical jurisprudence well known and fully admitted in the sixth century, that in matters of importance—especially in such as were connected with dogmas of faith—the first decision should be pronounced by the Apostolic See; this sentence preceding the judgment of the Patriarchs and Bishops, whether isolated or assembled in Council, and serving to direct the decision. When Justinian forced the Patriarchs and Bishops of the East to sign

[600] In *Constituto Vigilii* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1320).

[601] "Quæ sæpius ab ipso (Vigilio) facta sunt ad condemnationem Trium Capitulorum, vos audientes alacriores efficiamini, de his formam celeriter proferre," etc. (l. c.).

his edict of condemnation against the Three Chapters, Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, openly declared that he could not sign it without the consent of the Apostolic See,[602] and when forced to subscribe, he submitted on the condition that his act of adhesion should be returned to him in case the Pope refused to ratify it.[603] Zoilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, went to meet Pope Vigilius in Sicily in order to justify his conduct in yielding to violence and signing the imperial edict.[604] Facundus Hermianensis testifies the same of the other Oriental Bishops who had been compelled to put their signature to the edict of the Prince.[605] When the Synod met in Constantinople, the Fathers were most anxious that the Pope should pronounce his judgment on the subject of the Three Chapters; and Vigilius referred to the right of his See to be the first to give sentence.[606] Justinian, therefore, being aware of the sentiments of the assembled Bishops, communicated to them the documentary proof that the Roman Pontiff had already condemned the Three Chapters, and had bound himself with a solemn oath that they should everywhere be anathematised.[607] The Bishops were thus encouraged to vote a sentence of condemnation. But before legislating on that subject, the Fathers again declared that Vigilius had already condemned the Three Chapters by word of mouth and by writing.[608] It is impossible therefore to agree with Mgr. Maret in his

[602] Facundus Herm., *De Tribus Capitulis*, l. iv., cap. iv. (Gallandi, t. xi., p. 708).

[603] *Ibid.*, l. c.

[604] *Ibid.*, l. c.

[605] *Ibid.*, l. c.

[606] In *Constituto* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1320).

[607] See this document in the Fifth Synod, Coll. vii. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 194).

[608] Conc. Constantin. ii., Coll. viii. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 199).

assertion that the majority did not go over to the Pope.[609] The Fifth Synod pronounced its sentence of condemnation against the Three Chapters because it learnt from authentic sources that these documents had already been visited with the Papal anathema. In this case then, no less than before, the General Synod followed in the footsteps of the Roman Pontiff, although it had not in hand any controversy of faith. This fact again confirms the great principle that the task of a General Council is not to regulate the conduct of the Roman Pontiff, but to submit to his authentic leadership. Let us suppose for a moment that the Fifth Council had officially received the *Constitutum* of Pope Vigilius, and had submitted to its orders; what evil consequences would have followed? The Synod in that case would have abstained from a condemnation from which two Ecumenical Councils had previously abstained, without inflicting the slightest injury on the deposit of Catholic doctrine.

But under the combination of the circumstances mentioned above, the Synod of Constantinople, which had the character of an Ecumenical Council, did pass a sentence against the Three Chapters. The Pope was then called upon to decide what course he would pursue. Had he insisted on the observance of his orders, then a new and more fatal schism would have arisen in the Church, and the Eastern party would have received the support of the Emperor Justinian. Vigilius was sincerely anxious for the peace and unity of the Church. But the peace and unity of the Church required once more a change in the economy which he had adopted in the *Constitutum.* Especially as after more diligent research he found that the state of the things did actually demand the condemnation of writings to which the enemies of the Church looked for support. Moreover, a

[609] *Du Concile Général,* l. ii., ch. vii., n. viii., t. i., p. 270.

new study of the Acts of Chalcedon had corrected his persuasion that the Council had pronounced a judgment favourable to the orthodoxy of the letter of Ibas. Pope Vigilius, therefore, having taken all this into consideration, after the lapse of six months from the end of the Synod, addressed a Letter to the Patriarch Eutychius, in which he condemned the works and the name of Theodorus, as well as those writings of Theodoret and Ibas which favoured Nestorius.[610] But in this document, as well as in the new *Constitutum*, which was perhaps addressed to the Eastern Bishops,[611] he made no mention whatever of the Fifth Council; and the purpose of this omission was to show that other considerations, and not the authority of a Synod which was yet unrecognised, had brought him to this new resolution. Then, and only then, the Synod of Constantinople began to have authority in the Church, and to be ranked among the Ecumenical Councils.

To conclude. The authentic Acts of Pope Vigilius in this intricate controversy, not only give no indication of any change of doctrine, but speak loudly in favour of the moderation, zeal, and generosity of the Pontiff, who thus sufficiently repaired the fault of his shameful seizure of the Pontificate from the hands of Silverius. But the unexampled difficulties brought upon the Pope and the Church in this stormy controversy, are due to nothing but the despotic and obstinate interference of the Byzantine Emperor with matters which must always be above the scope of the civil power.

[610] *Epist. Decretalis Vigilii Papæ ad Eutychium* (Labbe, t. vi., p. 239, seq. In Migne, t. lxix., *PP. LL.*, p. 121, seq.).

[611] *Constitutum Vigilii Papæ pro damnatione Trium Capitulorum* (Labbe, t. vi., p. 281, seq. In Migne, l. c., p. 143, seq.).

SECTION XI.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE SIXTH COUNCIL. CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS.

THE Sixth General Council, and the condemnation of Pope Honorius, form as favourite a topic of the opponents of Papal Infallibility as the *Constitutum* of Pope Vigilius. Jansenists and ultra-Gallicans of old times and of our days make the utmost efforts to urge this argument, which they believe to be unanswerable. We will try to be not only as clear but also as short as possible, since we have already published a work on the matter, to which our readers can easily apply for further explanation.[612]

Monothelism was one of the principal forms under which Monophytism struggled to regain life and popular favour. Although in its substance it is of ancient date in the Church, and was taught by Arians and Apollinarists, and also expressly by the Nestorians, still it was a true offspring of Monophytism, especially of the branch of the Severians.[613] In reality the Monothelites renewed the errors of Apollinaris and Severus, as is asserted by the first two Councils of Lateran and the third of Constantinople.[614] The new error differed from

[612] *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History.* London, 1868.

[613] *Ibid.*, sec. i., p. 7, seq.

[614] *Libellus Stephani Dorensis.* In Conc. Lat., Secr. ii. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 105); et Secr. iv. (l. c., p. 270). Conc. vi., Act. iv., *Epist. Agathonis Papæ* (Labbe, t. vii., p. 692).

that of the Severians in this only—that in the system of Severus it was a corollary from his principles concerning the Manhood of Christ, while in that of the Monothelites it was the fundamental principle itself. This sect maintained from the beginning that, as in Christ there was only one Person, so also there was only one operation. From the documents referred to both in the Council of Lateran and in the Sixth Ecumenical Council, we gather that the Monothelites, while acknowledging that the Humanity of Christ possessed Body and Soul, with all the faculties of each, nevertheless asserted that these were unable to perform any operation whatever by themselves; all operation, both of the human and divine Nature, was ascribed to the Divine Word, Who used His Humanity as an instrument of His Divinity. What we say of the two operations must also be understood of the two wills in Christ. The Monothelites denied the natural will of the Humanity of Christ, and advocated one personal will; they endeavoured to justify their error by arguing that the existence of two wills in the one indivisible Person of Christ would imply a state of struggle and conflict in Him.[615] Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, and principally Sergius of Constantinople, and his successors, Pyrrhus and Paul, were the main supporters of the sect and of its errors.

Pope Honorius did not understand the true character of the error, which, strong in the imperial patronage, was spreading all over the East, and preparing great calamities for the Church. He was deceived by the cunning letters of Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and believed that if the economy of silence were imposed on each of the contending parties, it would end the new controversy and soon restore peace and calm to the Christian people. That economy was

[615] See *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. i., p. 11, seq.

undoubtedly ill-timed; it had the effect of adding to the strength of the heretical party, and of giving wider currency to the error. But the successors of Honorius, Severinus, John IV., and Theodore, aware of the mistake of their predecessor, solemnly condemned the new heresy. Popes Severinus and John IV., in the years 639 and 640, in two Roman Synods, anathematised the error of the Monothelites, as well as the *Ecthesis* of the Emperor Heraclius, in which the new error was enjoined in an obligatory profession of faith.[616] Pope Theodore, in 648, in a Council also held at Rome, rejected again the new heresy, and with it the *Typus* of the Emperor Constans (which, like the *Ecthesis*, favoured the Monothelites), by forbidding the confession of a doctrine of faith which had been defined by Popes Severinus and John IV.[617] Nevertheless, as the Monothelites were becoming more powerful in the Eastern Church under the patronage of the Emperor Constans, Martin I., successor of John IV., assembled in 649 another Synod of 105 Bishops in the Lateran Church, in order to pass a still more solemn condemnation on the heresy and the imperial edicts, both which had already been anathematised by his three predecessors.[618] Now Mgr. Maret thinks it impossible to consider that the decisions pronounced by these three Popes, and by Martin I. in the Council of Lateran, were dogmatic definitions of faith; and he holds that an Ecumenical Council was necessary, giving his reason in the words—"On reconnaissait généralement alors que la dernière ne s'etait pas encore prononcée touchant la controverse qui divisait les Chrétiens."[619] We cannot agree. The Decrees of Severinus, of John IV., of Theodore, and of Martin,

[616] Synodus Romana (Labbe, t. vi., pp. 1507, 1526).
[617] Synodus Romana (Labbe, t. vi., p. 1601).
[618] Conc. Lateran. i. sub Martino I. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 78, seq.).
[619] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. viii., n. iii., t. i., p. 277.

had been received in the Church as definitions of faith long before the Sixth Synod had published its decision on the subject. In the formula of faith pronounced by Bishops before their consecration by the Pope, we find that they professed to receive all the Decrees of the Pontiffs Severinus, John IV., Theodore, and Martin,[620] and they put this profession on the same level with the definition of the Sixth Synod in the cause of the Monothelites.[621] Nothing which is not the infallible utterance of a supreme authority can be the object of a profession of faith, nor be put on a level with the Decree of a General Council. And the expressions used—"Quæcumque susceperunt (Decreta Pontificum), suscipimus et tota fidei integritate veneramur," evidently imply that what is contained in the Pontifical Decrees was an integral part of the faith. According to this maxim, when Pyrrhus, being convinced by the arguments of St. Maximus in Africa, repaired to Rome to seek reconciliation with the Roman Pontiff, he was obliged to present his *Libellus* of faith, and in this he professed the doctrine of Two Wills and Operations, as defined by the Popes;[622] and when he fell back again to his errors he was anathematised by Pope Theodore, and deprived of his episcopal authority as a traitor to the faith.[623] It must be remembered, too, that the

[620] "Profitemur etiam cuncta decreta Pontificum Apostolicæ Sedis, idest sanctæ recordationis Severini, Joannis, Theodori atque Martini, custodire . . . et quæcumque damnaverunt, sub anathemate damnamus: quæcumque susceperunt, suscipimus et tota fidei integritate veneramur" (*Liber Diurnus RR. PP.*, cap. iii., tit. vi. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. cv., p. 66, seq.).

[621] "Ad hæc suscipio et amplector et veneror definitionem, quam, Deo auspice, sancta, universalis ac magna sexta Synodus," etc. (l. c.).

[622] Conc. Lat., Secr. i. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 91); Anastasius Bibl., in *Vita Theodori Papæ* (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. cxxviii., p. 723).

[623] *Ibid.*, et *Hist. Miscella*, l. xviii. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xcv., p. 1042).

Council of Lateran had the authority of an Ecumenical Council, so that in the third formula of faith of the Roman Pontiffs it held its place between the Fifth and the Sixth Synods.[624] It is, then, difficult to agree with Mgr. Maret that, after the definitions of the Lateran Synod, "la dernière autorité ne s'était pas encore prononcée touchant la controverse qui divisait les Chrétiens." And in that very Synod many clear proofs of the Infallibility of the Popes were given by Bishops belonging to every province of the Church. The numerous *Libelli* and synodical letters which were then presented to the Synod, spoke of the Roman See and of the Pope as being the true foundation of faith, the teacher of truth, the centre of Catholic doctrine.[625]

Let us see what are the reasons on which Mgr. Maret and the rest of the Gallican School rest their assertion. He says that Constantine Pogonatus "tenait les deux partis pour orthodoxes."[626] This is no wonder, for this Prince, though brought up in Catholic principles, still had lived in very stormy times, and in a country which had been for about sixty years under the sway of the Monothelites. Constantine was anxious to restore calm and concord in the Eastern provinces, and he speaks in a tone of conciliation in order to appease the apprehensions of the schismatic party, and to bring them to terms of peace and agreement. In the hope of inspiring the contending parties with sentiments of moderation and prudence, he gave the name of orthodox to both. But this is done only in pursuance of a sort of economy, which the Church would certainly not condemn when used by a Prince on the eve of an Ecumenical Council, which he had proposed to assemble

[624] *Liber Diurnus RR. PP.*, cap. ii., tit. ix. (Migne, l. c., p. 58).
[625] Conc. Lat., Secr. ii. (Labbe, t. vii., pp. 108, 118, 159, etc.).
[626] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. viii., n. iii., t. i., p. 277.

to the effect of restoring peace between the contending parties. The Monothelites, though definitively condemned, had not as yet been cast out of the Church with all the solemnity which accompanies the sentence of an Ecumenical Synod. A Universal Synod, as we have repeatedly said, is the final effort and the last resource which the Church employs for the reconciliation of the heretics or for their final destruction. When, therefore, a General Council is near at hand, it suits well with the habitual mercy of the Church to wink at the application of the honourable name of Orthodox even to heretics; this is in the hope that their hearts will be softened by this condescension, and that they will be better disposed to receive the grace of conversion. We find an instance of this forbearance in the conduct prescribed by Pope Celestine, and observed by the Council of Ephesus towards Nestorius. And in what we have said we have anticipated the answer to Mgr. Maret's second reason. He says that Macarius "qui se trouvait indirectement sous le poids des anathèmes du Concile de Latran . . . du consentement des Légats, fut admis au Concile avec tous les titres, les honneurs et les droits des autres Evêques."[627] All that is here adduced must be referred to the same economy, by which an exception was made to the disciplinary Canons of the Church, in the hope of bringing back a sinner into the path of righteousness. As to Mgr. Maret's final objection, drawn from the supposed uselessness of General Councils on the supposition of Papal Infallibility, this difficulty has been fully explained in the seventh section of this book.

We must now see how the proposal of an Ecumenical Council made by the Emperor was received by Pope Agatho. Beyond doubt he received it with great fervour and lively joy, for he saw in it a clear proof of the

[627] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. viii., n. iv., t. i., p. 279.

Catholic sentiments of the Prince, and of his anxiety to put an end to a controversy which had caused so great evils to the Church and to the Empire, for which purpose he found no more suitable means than a General Council. He was right. In similar circumstances, as we have seen in the foregoing sections, the Church has always resorted to the like expedient. Nevertheless, the Pope, while granting the Council, had no thought whatever of applying to the "dernière autorité" in the Church, or procuring a solemn confirmation of the definitions of the Apostolic See. To send his Legates to a Synod, in order to discuss anew points of faith which had been already settled by his predecessors, with the intention that the Council should have power to alter or modify what had been defined by the Apostolical authority, would have been nothing short of denying Papal Infallibility. Consequently, he sent his Legates with strict orders that they should do no more than explain and enforce in the Council the traditional doctrine of his Apostolic See, as it had been laid down by preceding Pontiffs.[628] Their mission was not to discuss or examine, as if the matter were doubtful and uncertain, but they were briefly to set forth the certain and unchangeable doctrine of the Roman See.[629] This resolution of the Pope and of the Roman Synod was officially communicated by Agatho to the Emperor as well as to the Synod, in order that all might know upon

[628] "Ut nihil præsumant augere, minuere, vel mutare, sed traditionem hujus Apostolicæ Sedis, ut a prædecessoribus Apostolicis Pontificibus instituta est, sinceriter enarrare" (*Epistola Agathonis Papæ ad Const. Pogonat. Imp.* In Act. iv., Conc. vi Labbe, t. vii., p. 655).

[629] "Non tamen tanquam de incertis contendere, sed ut certa atque immutabilia compendiosa definitione proferre" (*Epistola Agathonis Papæ ad Synodum Sextam.* In Act. iv., Conc. vi. Labbe, l. c., p. 714). See *Pope Honorius*, sec. iv., pp. 86, 87.

what terms an Ecumenical Council was allowed by the Apostolical See.

These resolutions are in themselves enough to show the full persuasion of Pope Agatho and of his Roman Synod that Papal definitions were infallibly true. Unless a Papal definition is held as infallible and irreformable, it would be absurd for a Pope to declare that an Ecumenical Council, representing the Universal Church, is not at liberty, after new researches, to alter or modify it in the slightest manner. But if so, then the Ecumenical Council is no longer "la dernière autorité," as compared with Papal authority. Mgr. Maret admits the facts, and still he denies their consequences. He must be responsible for his own logic. It must not be thought that Pope Agatho gave the foregoing instructions to his Legates in a private and secret manner; he openly noticed them in his Letter to the Sixth Synod,[630] that all might understand what was the mission which the Legates of the Apostolic See were to discharge in the Synod of Constantinople. Nay, both in his Letters to the Emperor and to the Council, he fully explains the reasons on which these instructions were based; this is none other than the privilege of Infallibility divinely conferred on the See of Peter. Therefore he openly asserts that, by virtue of this supernatural gift, his See had always been exempt from all taint or error,[631] and he declares that all who wish to save their souls must unanimously profess the form of faith which rests on the Apostolic tradition of Peter, who is the foundation of the Church. Consistently with this, he denounces in the

[630] See the Letter of Agatho to the Council, quoted above (l. c.).

[631] "Quæ (Ecclesia Romana) ejus (Petri Apostoli) gratia et præsidio ab omni errore illibata permanet," etc. (*Epist. Agathonis ad Const. Imp.*, l. c. Labbe, t. vii., p. 698). This passage, whether in its context or not, can have no meaning but that which we attributed to it.

severest terms all who reject the same form, as guilty of a betrayal of the faith, and as deserving a rigorous judgment at the tribunal of Christ.[632] He judges all to be enemies of the Catholic and Apostolic confession, and subject to perpetual condemnation, who shall refuse to teach the doctrine which he propounds,[633] and over and over again he refers to the Infallibility of the Apostolic See as to a pledge and justification of his utterance. He declares that all the orthodox Fathers and all the General Councils had always venerated the teaching of the Roman See, and entirely and faithfully adhered to it; that it had been calumniated and persecuted by none but heretics.[634] He solemnly asserts that it had never at any time declined from the straight path of truth, but that it had always been preserved from error since the Apostles placed in it the doctrine of revealed dogma, and that it should always so last till the end of time, pure and immaculate in its teaching. He alleges in proof of this the promise made by our Lord to Peter, that his faith should never fail.[635]

[632] Epist. Agathonis cit., l. c. (Labbe, l. c., p. 703).

[633] Epist. Synod. Agathonis cit., l. c. (Labbe, l. c., p. 715).

[634] *Epist. Agath. ad Constantinum Aug.*, l. c. (Labbe, l. c., p. 659).

[635] "Cujus (Petri) annitente præsidio hæc Apostolica ejus [Ecclesia nunquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est, cujus auctoritatem utpote Apostolorum omnium principis semper omnis Catholica] Ecclesia et universales synodi fideliter amplectentes in cunctis secutæ sunt" (Labbe, l. c., p. 659). "Quæ (Ecclesia Romana) per Dei Omnipotentis gratiam a tramite Apostolicæ traditionis nunquam errasse probabitur, nec hæreticis novitatibus depravata succubuit, sed ut ab exordio fidei Christianæ percepit ab auctoribus suis Apostolorum Christi Principibus illibata fine tenus permanet, secundum ipsius Domini Salvatoris divinam pollicitationem, quam suorum Discipulorum Principi in sacris Evangeliis fatus est: 'Petre, Petre, inquiens,' etc."—Luc. xxii. 31, 32—(Labbe, l. c., 662). Mr. Renouf, in his recent pamphlet (*The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered*, p. 46, seq.), attacks the

Such is the language in which Pope Agatho and his Synod addresses the Emperor and the Sixth Council. The Roman Pontiff does not expect from the Fathers a

argument in favour of Papal Infallibility drawn from the two passages of St. Agatho's Letter. He says that the first is spurious because the words which we have placed in brackets are not found in the Greek text; and objects that the other does not refer to the Roman Church. The writer is mistaken on both points. As to the first, the argument of Mr. Renouf can be reduced to the following syllogistic form: Every passage which is not found in the Greek text (at least, of the Sixth Council) is spurious; but the words in question are not found in it—then they are spurious. The major, as proposed, is evidently uncritical and false. In the Acts of this very Council, at least seven other passages, beside the one mentioned, are found in the Latin text, the words of which are not in the Greek text. Hardouin and others indicate these omissions in their printed text. (See in Hardouin, t. iii., Conc. vi., Act. iv., pp. 1080, 1116; Act. ix., p. 1193; Act. x., p. 1249; Act. xi., p. 1296; Act. xvi., p. 1384; Act. xviii., p. 1409; *Edict. Const. Imp.*, p. 1457.) The only place in the Acts of the Sixth Synod pointed out by Hardouin as spurious, is to be found in the Greek text (Act. xi., p. 1292), being a passage inserted in the Epistle of Sophronius, where, strange to say, Pope Honorius is anathematised by the great Bishop of Jerusalem. Cotelerius had already remarked the interpolation (*Monum. Eccl. Græc.*, t. i., in nota ad p. 325. Parisiis, 1677). Binius, in his edition of the Councils, although he had compared a large number of manuscripts, was unable to fill up a large gap in the Greek text where just the words in question should be found (*Conc.*, t. v., p. 35. Parisiis, 1630). Hardouin, Labbe, Mansi, &c., filled it up with the help of other copies, but even they did not give the whole. The gap was thus reduced to the words within brackets. But as the part of the Greek text which was found, justified the authenticity of the Latin text of the ancient versions, we should infer that the Latin words in brackets are the exact version of the part which could not be supplied by the mutilated manuscripts. Especially, it must be remarked, that in all the most ancient manuscripts of the Latin version—without any exception—the words in question are found. So that, to declare the words spurious, would argue an absolute want of criticism. Besides this, the passage, read without the words in brackets, either

new definition of faith. He points out to the Bishops that they should believe and profess, and confirm by their Decrees, the traditional infallible doctrine of the

would give no meaning at all, or would equally bear on Papal Infallibility. As to the other passage, we may gratuitously deny what Mr. Renouf gratuitously asserts—that the passage does not refer to the Roman Church. But we will allege for our position the reason which Mr. Renouf is not able to produce in defence of his own. In the first passage mentioned above, Pope Agatho said, "Hæc Apostolica Ecclesia," and he certainly meant the Roman Church. Nor does Mr. Renouf deny this. Now, in the passage which we have in hand, he uses the same expression. He says: *αὕτη ἡ πνευματικὴ μήτηρ τοῦ ὑμετέρου γαληναίου κράτους ἡ ἀποστολικὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία*—"*This* Apostolic Church of Christ, spiritual Mother of your serene Empire." Agatho did not speak of the Church of Christ, which is Apostolic, but of *this* Apostolic Church, as in the first passage; of this he says, that she is the spiritual Mother of the Roman Empire, and of this he asserts, that she shall never decline from the path of the Apostolic tradition. Mr. Renouf did not notice in the text the particle *αὕτη*, which points out one Church in particular, and in a definite manner. No wonder that the Roman Church is called the spiritual Mother of the Empire, since the Christian Empire had its birth in Rome with Constantine, under the powerful influence of the Christian religion. It was at Rome that Constantine received the light of the true faith, and therefore it could be said without exaggeration that the Roman See was truly the spiritual Mother of the Christian Empire. But, moreover, Agatho, in order to point still more distinctly to the Roman Church, mentions, in the very same passage, the two Princes of the Apostles, who had planted with their blood the new faith of Christ in the Roman Church. Finally, Pope Agatho appeals to the promises made by Christ to Peter, and in him to his successors. Those promises regard properly the Roman Church; and therefore—still in the same passage—the Pope concludes that the Roman Pontiffs had always fulfilled the duty of confirming their brethren in the faith. We see then that the beginning, the middle, and the end of the passage in question, prove to demonstration that it must be referred to the Roman Apostolic Church. This is one instance of the unfair criticism adopted by Mr. Renouf against the defenders of Papal Infallibility.

Roman See, which all his predecessors had always taught. If we read with attention the Letters of Pope Agatho to the Emperor and to the Sixth Synod, and compare them with the time and the circumstances in which they were written, we shall be forced to conclude that they form a summary treatise on the supreme infallible authority of the Apostolic See, considered in its principles and in its practical application. The Oriental Church had fallen into schism because it had allowed itself to be led away by the subtleties of the Monothelite teachers, and had refused to listen to the infallible voice of the Roman Pontiffs. Now it looked for reconciliation and unity from a Universal Council. Pope Agatho, in his two Letters, points out the way of reconciliation and unity. He sets forth the formula of Catholic faith, which is the formula of the Apostolic *magisterium* of the Roman See; and he insists that all must believe and confess it, and, on the other hand, condemn and reject every dogma contrary to it. Should any refuse to submit to this rule of faith, they would be in error, in schism, and in reprobation. But the Pope could not impose a formula of faith to be believed and confessed, unless his *magisterium* was universally acknowledged as infallible. Therefore he repeatedly insists on that capital point of doctrine. He declares that the Roman See has never erred, and that it never shall err. He confirms and explains his assertion by referring to the promises of Christ, to the example of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and of the Ecumenical Synods themselves, which had always received from Rome the paradigm of the doctrine that they were to define. At the same time, as supreme and infallible Doctor in the Church, he not only proposes the Catholic form of faith with regard to the two wills and operations in Christ, but he also exposes the errors of Monothelism, and by drawing

out the traditional doctrine of all the Fathers, he shows the fallacies of the heretics, and affords new weapons for their demolition. Thus we see that the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Roman See is far from being artfully inserted in the Letters of Pope Agatho, as Dr. Döllinger has imagined.[636] This doctrine is woven into their very substance; it is the groundwork of their whole argument. If we make abstraction for a moment from that teaching, the whole drift of the two Letters is pointless and meaningless. How could Agatho proclaim an Ecumenical Council to be in error and reprobation, should it decline to receive at his hands the doctrine of faith, had he not been infallible—had the doctrine of Papal Infallibility not been a traditional dogma in the Universal Church? Mr. Renouf believes that if the mere scraps of passages of Agatho's Letters (already quoted in our pamphlet on Pope Honorius, in favour of Papal Infallibility) are read in their true context, they have not the meaning which is attributed to them.[637] By this language the writer shows plainly that he does not understand the context of those Letters, or that he takes his own fancy as giving their true context.

Now let us see in what spirit the assembled Fathers received the two Letters of Pope Agatho. No voice of protest was lifted up against the fundamental doctrine of Infallibility, which the Pontiff attributed to his Apostolical See, and which he rested on the promises of Christ Himself. The Bishops did not pass any censures on Agatho's Letter — they received it as a whole, and in all its points. Therefore they received the doctrine of Papal Infallibility which was so promi-

[636] *Die Papst Fabeln*, p. 137. Mr. Renouf should be reminded that Dr. Döllinger believes, no less than the Ultramontanes, that Agatho maintained his Infallibility in the Letters in question.

[637] *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. iv., p. 87, seq.

nently stated in those Letters, and intimately connected with the whole of them. The Fathers testified their admission of these Letters, as possessing infallible authority, in the Eighth Session, as well as in the synodical letter addressed to Pope Agatho; and in the Prosphonetic letter sent to the Emperor they treated them as being a rule of faith.[638] When suspicion arose that four Bishops and two Monks rejected the two Pontifical Missives, the Council ordered that they should give explanation of their faith in writing and on oath: whereupon the accused accepted without reserve all the heads of the doctrine contained in the Letters.[639] Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, was deposed from his dignity and expelled from the Synod, because he refused to profess adherence to the Letters of Agatho.[640] In this we see that the Sixth Council acknowledged (1.) that the Apostolical See was infallible in its authentic *magisterium;* (2.) that the Ecumenical Council was bound to receive at the hands of the Roman Pontiff the doctrine which all were to believe.

Mgr. Maret objects that the Letters of Agatho were examined by the Bishops before being accepted by them, as we read at the end of the Seventh Session.[641] We reply (1.) that, as we have frequently remarked, it is the duty of every Ecumenical Synod to examine the doctrine which is proposed to be defined, for the

[638] Conc. Constantin. iii., Act. viii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 760); *Epist. Synod. ad Agathonem Papam.* In Act. xviii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1009); *Sermo Prosphoneticus ad Constant.* In Act. xviii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1089).

[639] Conc. Constantin. iii., Act. x. (Labbe, l. c., p. 873, seq.). This was the declaration, expressed in the formula which they presented to the Synod, that they adhered simply and without reserve to all the points of Pope Agatho's Letters.

[640] Conc. Constantin. iii., Act. viii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 768).

[641] *Ibid.*, Act. vii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 751).

reason which has so often been mentioned—the Fathers in Council are truly judges of the faith. But (2.) the objection of Mgr. Maret does not affect our position; it comes to this, that the Sixth Synod, after due consideration, accepted and professed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, as stated by Pope Agatho in his two Letters. Therefore what the Fathers said in the Eighth Session must be referred to the infallibility of the *magisterium* which is set forth in the two Letters. Because they believed the Pope infallible, they regarded these Letters as dictated by the Holy Ghost;[642] as if Peter himself, the Head of the Apostles, had written them by inspiration,[643] and spoken them through the lips of Pope Agatho.[644] This was why they condemned what had been condemned by the Letters, and sanctioned that formula of faith which Agatho submitted to their plenary judgment.[645]

Nevertheless, the condemnation of Pope Honorius by the Sixth Council is for Mgr. Maret, as well as for the old and modern ultra-Gallicans, the chief argument for impugning the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.[646] At the present time, when the question has been so much discussed, the opponents of the doctrine have no better argument to resort to than the condemnation of Pope Honorius. Thus Dr. Döllinger in Germany,[647] Mr.

[642] Conc. Constantin. iii., Act. viii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 759).

[643] *Epist. Synodalis ad Agathonem Papam.* In Act. xviii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1109).

[644] *Epist. ad Constantinum Imp.* In Act. xviii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1089).

[645] In this part of his work, Dr. Pusey has no other merit than that of giving in good English a part of the eighth chapter of Mgr. Maret's work, which we have examined.

[646] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. viii., n. viii., seq., p. 287, seq.

[647] *Die Papst Fabeln des Mittelalters*, n. vii., pp. 131—151. München, 1863.

Renouf in England,[648] M. de Rozière[649] and F. Gratry in France,[650] and with them a swarm of journalists, infidel or Protestant, parade this argument as if it presented an insuperable obstacle to the views of those who uphold the Papal prerogative. Dr. Pusey could not be expected to have any better argument at hand against Catholic dogma; and in this case, as in so many others, he has faithfully collected what Gallicans and Protestants have written against Honorius, at the same time paying no attention to the full refutations put forth by the numerous apologists of the accused Pope.[651] A sketch of the controversy will suffice for the purposes of the present work.

Until the rise of Gallicanism the case of Honorius had been nearly forgotten. The Jansenists, though stubborn enemies of Papal Infallibility, vindicated the orthodoxy of that Pope's Letters, hoping thereby to secure an argument against the infallibility of the Church on dogmatic facts. The Catholics of the Roman School, on the other hand, adopted various lines of opinion. Some rejected the authenticity of those passages in the Sixth Council, and in the Letters of Pope Leo II., which speak of the condemnation. Others admitted their authenticity, but they maintained that the Council was misled by calumnious information with regard to Honorius. Some, again, thought that Pope Honorius mistook as to the right conception of the Catholic doctrine, but

[648] *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius; The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered.* London, 1868, 1869.

[649] *Liber Diurnus*, publié par Eugène Rozière. Introduction. Paris.

[650] *Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans et Mgr. l'Archevêque de Malines.* Paris, 1870.

[651] *Eirenicon*, pt. iii., *Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?* p. 189, seq.

that his error was not taught by him *ex cathedrâ.* Others finally accept all the Acts of the Council, and, although they deny the Letters of Honorius to be an utterance *ex cathedrâ,* yet they maintain that they convey no dogmatical error. We agree with these last. A threefold question therefore claims examination here. (1.) Do the Letters of Honorius constitute a definition *ex cathedrâ?* (2.) Do they contain any error in matter of dogma? (3.) Upon what ground did the Sixth Council condemn the Pope? The question which concerns Papal Infallibility is not necessarily connected with that which regards the integrity of the faith of Honorius, nor even with that of his condemnation for the crime of heresy. If his Letters are orthodox, or at least if they were not utterances *ex cathedrâ,* the dogma of Papal Infallibility is in no way compromised. Moreover, in order that his condemnation by an Ecumenical Council should have any bearing on the doctrine which we maintain, it should be proved that the Synod condemned Honorius for having taught heresy in the Church in the solemn exercise of his Pontifical *magisterium,* and that his condemnation was sanctioned in those very terms by the Apostolic See.

First, then, we assert that the two Letters of Honorius have not the character of any utterance *ex cathedrâ.* For a Pontifical Letter to be a teaching *ex cathedrâ,* it is required that the Pope, either formally or implicitly, should speak to the Universal Church, though he may have addressed his Missives to a particular Bishop in a particular diocese. Moreover, the question which he defines must be a tenet of faith. Because the word *cathedra* means the *magisterium* of the Head of the Church, and Papal *magisterium* concerns things of faith. Again, it is essential that such a definition should not leave open the questions which it defines: otherwise it would not have the character of an utterance of a

supreme *magisterium* from which there is no appeal. It follows that a definition *ex cathedrâ* must formally, or at least implicitly, import the obligation of an absolute assent to it on the part of the Faithful throughout the Church. Now the Letters of Honorius did not bear these characters. First, the Pope addressed his Letters to Sergius, and at the same time he informed him that he had also expressed the same sentiments to Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and to Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem.[652] But evidently he did not intend his Letters for circulation among the Bishops either of the West or of the East. It is undeniable that till Pyrrhus published an extract from the first of the Letters of Honorius, they were generally unknown in the Latin Church; nor does any record exist showing that they were communicated to the Oriental Bishops. Sergius, who ought to have been interested in the matter, was rather anxious to withdraw them from view. He did not mention them in the *Ecthesis*, which was his own composition; he buried them in the Patriarchal Archives, where they were found at the time of the Sixth Council.[653] Had the Letters of Honorius contained a definition of faith, they would have been put in circulation throughout the Church; because the *magisterium* of the Supreme Pastor in a matter of faith concerns all; that all may believe the same, in conformity with the teaching of the authentic authorities appointed by Christ. Now the Letters in question had not for their proper aim to dispose of any matter of faith, but they concerned ecclesiastical economy: the last Letter concerned no one except the three Patriarchs, to whom the Pontifical determinations were

[652] *Epist.* ii. *Honorii ad Sergium.* In Act. xiii., Conc. Constant. iii. (Labbe, l. c., 1003).

[653] *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. ii., p. 33, seq.

really communicated. Here is the reason why they were not intended for circulation in the whole Church, and why they were actually withheld from circulation. That the Letters had for their own special and immediate object an ecclesiastical economy, is manifest from the purport of the letter of Sergius to Honorius, as well as of the answer returned by the Pope to the Patriarch. The occasion and the reason for which Sergius applied to the Pope was as follows. When Sophronius strongly opposed the Articles proposed by Cyrus of Alexandria to the Theodosians and signed by them, Sergius of Constantinople, who was the centre and the life of the whole Monothelite movement, was well aware that only a policy of silence could afford hope of bringing his deceitful and heretical labour of reconciliation to a successful issue. But in order to prop up his designs, and check on the other hand the opposition of Sophronius, who had already been raised to the see of Jerusalem, he needed a powerful support, which he could find nowhere but in Rome in the Apostolical See. Therefore he addressed to Pope Honorius a most insidious letter, with the view of gaining him over in favour of his policy of silence. Of course he used every artifice in his power calculated to deceive the Pope. He coloured his heretical doctrines with patriotic and Biblical allusions, and gave them a Catholic tint; he exaggerated the amount of the good which, as he represented, would be frustrated in the East by the use of formulæ of faith which had not yet received any Synodical sanction; he strove to impress the Pope with the necessity of the prudent economy of silence for both the contending parties with regard to the formulæ of one or two operations and wills of Christ. But he did not ask the Pontiff for any dogmatical definition. To ask for a dogmatical definition, and at the same time for the economy of silence, would

simply have been a formal contradiction. Besides this, it would have been the most imprudent step for the Monothelite leader if, under the circumstances, he had sought for a definition from the See which had issued the famous Letter of St. Leo on the doctrine of the Incarnation. Prudence would have suggested that it would be well at least to sound the mind of the Pontiff beforehand.[654]

Pope Honorius did not give an "unqualified approbation to the doctrine of Sergius," as Mr. Renouf asserts:[655] but he sanctioned the economy of silence on the subject of one or two operations in Christ; and at the same time he made a short exposition of the Catholic principles on the subject of the Incarnation, connected with the letter of Sergius: but he declared that he would define nothing on the point in question;[656] he approved and sanctioned only the economy of silence adopted by Sergius.[657] Now if he approved the economy of silence, and defined nothing in the matter, his Letters cannot be a teaching *ex cathedrâ*. They leave the controversy open, and consequently they do not impose on the Faithful any obligation to believe what is defined. Mr. Renouf thinks it to be a great objection, that Pope Honorius in his second Letter speaks as follows: "These things we have judged proper to make manifest

[654] *Pope Honorius*, sec. ii., p. 23, seq., and sec. i., p. 5, seq.

[655] *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 21.

[656] "Non nos oportet unam vel duas operationes definientes prædicare" (*Epist.* ii. *Honorii Papæ ad Sergium.* In Act. xiii., Conc. vi. Labbe, l. c., p. 1003). "Propter simplicitatem hominum et amputandas inextricabiles quæstionum ambages, sicut superius diximus, non unam vel duas operationes in mediatore Dei et hominum definire . . . debemus," etc. (*Ibid.*).

[657] "Hortantes vos ut unius vel geminæ novæ vocis inductum operationis vocabulum aufugientes," etc. (*Epist.* i. *Honorii ad Sergium.* In Act. xii., Conc. Constantin. iii. Labbe, l. c., p. 966); *Epist.* ii. *Honorii ad Sergium* (l. c.).

by the present Letters to your most holy fraternity for the instruction and knowledge of those who are in perplexity."[658] But what importance can these words have as a proof that the two Letters are a teaching *ex cathedrâ?* Honorius declares immediately after that he will not give a definition in the matter; but he is determined to suppress economically the two formulæ which he considers dangerous to the peace of the Church and to be sources of discord. Those then who were in perplexity must have been anxious to know whether they were authorised to abstain from both formulæ of faith, according to the orders of Sergius of Constantinople. On this account he informs them through the Patriarch, that they could without any fault omit the formula and remain faithful to the doctrine expressed by St. Leo in his dogmatic Epistle.[659] How can Mr. Renouf construe these words into a proof of the Letter being an utterance *ex cathedrâ?* According to the practice of the Church, in that age, some solemnities were necessary to be observed when dogmatic Constitutions *ex cathedrâ* were despatched by the Roman Pontiffs. Among them, the most important was the Synod, which on such occasions was held in Rome before the Pontifical definitions were pronounced. Now, by no contemporary document are we informed that Honorius ever held any Synod during the controversy, and for the cause of Monothelism; the *Liber Diurnus* confirms the point, for in the formulæ of faith which are found in it, the Pontiffs professed to hold all the

[658] *The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered*, p. 87, seq.

[659] Mr. Renouf calls this argument "extremely faulty" (*The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered*, p. 82); but he gives no reason for his opinion. He asserts that the Letter of St. Leo to Flavian was not published in a Synod. But how does he prove this? We showed the contrary in our pamphlet on Honorius, sec. ii., note 29, p. 19, seq.

Constitutions of their predecessors *which were synodically decreed.*[660] But since they condemned the Letters of Honorius, they show that they did not regard them as synodical. The Council itself abstained from calling them synodical. Finally, Sophronius would not have applied to the Pope for a dogmatic definition if the first Letter of Honorius had conveyed any. And even if the embassy which the Patriarch of Jerusalem intrusted to Stephen of Dora, sent by him to Rome, is not to be distinguished from the first, which arrived before Honorius wrote his second Letter to Sergius,[661] certainly this last cannot be considered as a definition, since it limits itself only to giving advice to the two parties to abstain from the use of the formulæ of one or two operations. The ambassadors of Sophronius, says Honorius himself, accepted the economy of silence on the condition that their adversaries would keep it faithfully on their side.[662] From which it is evident that no obligation whatever of believing was, either formally or implicitly, imposed on the Faithful with regard to the new controversy: it remained in the view of the Pope an open question, to be decided later by the Church. It cannot be said that the two Letters imply a Papal

[660] *Liber Diurnus RR. PP.*, cap. ii., tit. ix., professio ii. (In Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. cv., pp. 53, 54).

[661] We have proved in *Pope Honorius* (sec. ii., p. 36, seq.) that two embassies sent by Patriarch Sophronius to the Apostolic See should be distinguished. That of Stephen of Dora must have certainly reached Rome after the death of Pope Honorius. Dr. Döllinger himself is of this opinion (See *History of the Church*, vol. ii., sec. vii., p. 197; seq. London, 1840). Mr. Renouf simply denied this assertion with his habitual contempt, and passed over, as usual, most of the arguments alleged in our pamphlet (*The Case of Pope Honorius*, p. 27, seq.). This manner of refutation will deceive no one.

[662] *Epist.* ii. *Honorii Papæ ad Sergium.* In Act. xiii., Conc. vi. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1003).

definition *ex cathedrâ* concerning the Monothelite controversy.[663]

Now as to the doctrine contained in the two Letters, it seems incredible that in our age, after so many learned dissertations written on the subject, and a careful and critical analysis of their contents, the old view of the ultra-Gallicans should be brought forward afresh just as if the matter had not been thoroughly discussed. Mgr. Maret, Mr. Renouf, Dr. Döllinger, M. de Rozière, and F. Gratry, together with the mob of Protestant journalists, speak of the heretical doctrine of Pope Honorius as of a thing which no one could possibly doubt. But even among the old Gallicans, better critics than their modern followers, some were found who did not adopt this assertion; some proved its falsity, and some treated the point as finally settled. De Marca, a great authority in the Gallican School, says plainly: "Quod ad Honorii doctrinam attinet jam alii probaverunt eum prorsus aversum fuisse ab errore Monothelitarum, neque illis unquam consensisse; ut inutilis omnino futura sit mea opera, si velim hanc partem suscipere probandam."[664] And Baluze, who also enjoys high authority among Gallicans, fully concurs in the opinion of De Marca. The task which De Marca, a Gallican, and writing among Gallicans, believed to be useless, turns out in our own day to be necessary on account of the course taken by recent opponents of Papal Infallibility. Now (I.) that Honorius did not teach in his Letters *one* only operation in Christ (which is the fundamental tenet of Monothelites) is evident from an inspection of his Letters. We will confine ourselves to quoting one passage from his second Letter: "Utraque naturas," he says, "in uno Christo

[663] See on this subject *Pope Honorius*, sec. ii., pp. 16—44.

[664] In *Vita Petri De Marca*, a Baluzio scripta, præmissa ejus Operibus, p. 30. Edit. Parisiis, 1663.

unitate naturali copulatas cum alterius communione operantes, atque operatrices confiteri debemus: et divinam quidem quæ Dei sunt operantem, et humanam quæ carnis sunt exequentem, non divise, neque confuse, aut convertibiliter, Dei naturam in hominum, et humanam in Deum conversam edocentes," &c.[665] And he goes on to explain what he understands by the formulas *one* and *two* operations, according to the Catholic doctrine: "Pro una quam quidam dicunt, operatione, oportet nos unum operatorem Christum Dominum in utrisque naturis veridice confiteri: et pro duabus operationibus, ablato geminæ operationis vocabulo, ipsas potius duas naturas, id est divinitatis et carnis assumptæ in una persona Unigeniti Dei Patris, inconfuse, indivise, atque inconvertibiliter, nobiscum prædicare, propria operantes."[666] What is here taught is exactly the Catholic dogma, by which we profess that if we regard in Christ the Person, or as the Scholastics say, the *principium quod*, His operation is one, because the Operator is one, and the Divine Word is the only leading primary principle (τὸ ἡγεμονικόν) of all actions divine and human, free or natural and necessary, in Christ. But if we consider the two Natures, or the *principium quo*, His operations are two, distinct, and without confusion, the reason being that the two Natures are *propria operantes*." This doctrine was explained by St. Leo in his dogmatical Letter, and by Sophronius in his famous synodical; and it is the very doctrine afterwards defined by the Sixth Council.

But as we have elsewhere remarked,[667] Honorius in his first Letter used the word "operation," or "energy,"

[665] *Epist.* ii. *Honorii Papæ ad Sergium.* Conc. vi., Act. xiii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1003).

[666] L. c.

[667] *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. iii., p. 52, seq.

to mean what the Greeks called ἐνέργημα or the effect and external action. And this is the more manifest as Honorius quotes the words of St. Paul, in which the Apostle speaks of external acts (ἐνεργήματα) not of natural operation, or of the agency itself.[668] Mr. Renouf, in his recent pamphlet on the *Case of Honorius Reconsidered*,[669] passes over in silence what we said upon this point in the answer to his attacks on Pope Honorius, and simply repeats what he had said before, supporting it by the authority of the Protestant writer Dorner, who, however, as we shall soon see, is far from going the whole length with Mr. Renouf.[670] But Mr. Renouf thinks it "undeniable that Pope Honorius acknowledged but one will in Christ."[671] Dr. Döllinger had already said the same before him;[672] and now Mgr. Maret[673] insists on the same ground. We venture to differ from these two authorities. The words of Honorius are the following: "Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur D. N. J. C. quia profecto a Divinitate assumpta est nostra natura, non culpa; illa profecto quæ ante peccatum creata est, non quæ post prævaricationem vitiata."[674] Now, in these words we have the assertion of Pope Honorius and its proof: and the purport of the proof reveals in the clearest manner the nature of the assertion. The Pope does not lay down that in Christ there is one will, which is divine, but that in His Humanity there is only one will, and that the spiritual will. In

[668] 1 Cor. xii. 6; *Epist.* i. *Honorii.* In Act. xii., Conc. vi. (Labbe, p. 966).

[669] *The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered*, p. 23, seq.

[670] See on this subject *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. iii., p. 51, seq.

[671] *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 14.

[672] *Die Papst Fabeln*, pp. 132, 133.

[673] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. viii., n. viii., p. 288.

[674] *Epist.* i. *Honorii.* In Act. xii., Conc. vi. (Labbe, l. c., p. 963).

fact, his argument is as follows: The Word of God took to Himself our nature as it was created before sin, not as it was corrupted by transgression. Now our natural will, the will as a power of our soul, is not a fruit of sin; it was an essential part of our human nature, even before this nature was defiled with sin. Hence the Word of God, by assuming our nature, must have assumed its natural will. Again, the will which is a fruit of sin, and which is called sin in the Scripture, the will which did not exist in human nature in its state of innocence, is our concupiscence. The Word of God, therefore, by assuming our nature, could not assume that will; that is to say, our concupiscence."[675] Supposing Honorius to have asserted that in Christ there is only one will and that divine, what purport and meaning would his argument have had? In that supposition our spiritual will would not have existed in our nature when still innocent and in its integrity; it would have been the fruit of sin. No one would maintain such a view. On the contrary, the purport of the argument of Pope Honorius is such as to convey the idea that in the Humanity of Christ there is only the spiritual will, without any rebellious concupiscence which wars against the superior part of our soul—"Quæ repugnaret," he says, "legi mentis ejus." But Mr. Renouf, in his new pamphlet, rests his argument on the particle *unde* (ὅθεν), as implying that the confession of one will in Honorius' Letter is a corollary entirely dependent upon what precedes it. "In other words," says he, summing up the arguments of the Pope, there is but one Person in Christ, therefore there is but one will."[676] We grant indeed that the earlier sentence quoted by our adversary as a proof of Honorius' Monothelism is truly

[675] *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. iii., p. 54, seq.

[676] *The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered*, p. 19, seq.

connected with the preceding words by the link of the particle *unde.* But we deny that the Pope reasoned as Mr. Renouf thinks him to have done. Certainly Sergius, like all Monothelites, in order to justify his doctrine of one will in Christ, argued that an antagonism of wills attributed to the same Person, would produce the necessary result of the doctrine of two wills in Christ. From this, in opposition to every rule of logic, in their conclusion they denied the spiritual will of Christ, while in the premisses they had made mention only of His inferior will, or the concupiscence; because it is properly this that contradicts the law of reason and rebels against the divine law.[677] Now Pope Honorius, meeting this argument, really understood by Christ's second will opposite to God's will, the will of the corrupted flesh, "quæ repugnat legis mentis ejus," as he himself speaks;[678] but he did not change the meaning in the conclusion, as was done by the Monothelites. Pope Honorius accordingly reasoned as follows. In Christ the two Natures are substantially connected in the unity of the Divine Person. So that, whatever belongs to His Humanity is rightly ascribed to His Divinity, and we say that God suffers, He is crucified, &c. If then, two wills existed in His Humanity in a state of struggle one against the other, they with their acts must be attributed to the same One Divine Person. This is absurd. Consequently (*unde*) we do not admit in His Humanity any, but one spiritual, will, and we deny the existence of the rebel concupiscence, because the Word of God took to Himself our nature, not its sin nor the fruit of sin. Nevertheless, the Pope foresaw that a difficulty would arise against his doctrine from the words of Christ in the

[677] See Sergius' letter. In Act. xii., Conc. vi. (Labbe, l. c., p. 958); and Paul's letter. In Secret. iv., Conc. Lat. i. (Labbe, l. c., p. 234).

[678] *Epist.* i. *Honorii*, l. c. (Labbe, l. c., p. 959).

Garden, which seem to countenance the existence in Him of the rebel concupiscence; and considering these words under that aspect, he replied, that the passages quoted and other similar texts do not imply any contrariety of wills in Christ, but reveal a peculiar economical design of His assumed Humanity. He says: "Ista propter nos scripta sunt, quibus dedit exemplum ut sequamur vestigia ejus; pius magister discipulos imbuens, ut non suam unusquisque nostrûm, sed potius Domini in omnibus præferat voluntatem."[679] The Pope does not mean to assert that there was no human will in Christ; for if Christ had no human will, how could he afford us example of submission to God? He gave us the example of a perfect resignation, and moreover by His words He explained to us the real meaning of this virtue when transferred to our corrupt nature; that is to say, denial of our fleshly will with all its disorderly affections.[680] It is idle then in Mr. Renouf to compare the letter of the Patriarch Paul with that of Honorius. Although the wording of some particular passages of the two may be the same, still the purports of the whole are quite different. Paul truly reasons: "There is one Person in Christ, therefore there is but one will." But Honorius reasons, as we saw, in a perfectly different way: and his doctrine is orthodox, while that of his opponent is heretical.

What we have said could be confirmed by the clear testimony of contemporaries; as of Pope John IV., the successor of Honorius, of the Abbot John, his secretary, and of St. Maximus, the greatest Doctor of the age after the death of the Patriarch Sophronius. But for this argument we refer our readers to our pamphlet

[679] *Epist.* i. *Honorii.* (l. c.).

[680] See this doctrine more fully developed in our pamphlet on Pope Honorius, sec. iii., p. 55, seq.

on Honorius.[681] In the same place will be found many other proofs of the orthodoxy of this Pope, and the refutation of the calumny that his Letters are identical in idea with the *Ecthesis* and the *Typus*.[682] This weight of contemporary testimony determines us to adopt the view of Honorius' meaning which we have been explaining, in preference to another which might be upheld, and which would agree with the context, and with the orthodoxy of Honorius. It is plain that Honorius rejected the Monothelite tenet of "one operation in Christ;" even Dorner confesses this.[683] He taught the doctrine of two Natures operating of their own virtue what is proper to each. On the other side, he denied that in Christ there are two wills in habitual conflict: therefore he maintained that the Divine Word did not assume the rebel concupiscence which is the fruit of sin. Consequently the two wills, divine and human, free from whatever may cause conflict, must converge, at least in the effect of their action, into one will, which would be attributed to the one acting Person. Though Honorius acknowledged in Christ's Humanity human agency for the act of human volition, yet he considered this act practically; not as absorbed by the divine, but blended with and conveying a morally and effectually *one* act of volition with the divine: this convergence being due to their perfect harmony and concord, caused by the perfection of the assumed nature and by the hegemonic power of the Divine Person. Thus the doctrine of Honorius is very far from being Monothelitic; being grounded on the principle of the two operations of the two distinct Natures in Christ; and

681 *Pope Honorius*, sec. iii., p. 58, seq.

682 *Ibid.*, p. 66, seq.

683 *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, vol. i., div. ii., period ii., ep. i., p. 176, and note 38, p. 424. Edinburgh, 1861.

it is equally far from being Nestorian, on account of its resting on the dogma of the unity of His Divine Person. This second view of Honorius' doctrine is another confirmation that his Letters are easily susceptible of an orthodox meaning.

But the Sixth Council condemned him. This is the great argument in the hands of our adversaries. Now even if we should grant that the Sixth Council condemned Honorius as a heretic, nothing would follow from the admission against Papal Infallibility. In order to prove anything against this dogma, two points must be demonstrated: (1.) that the Sixth Council condemned Honorius for having taught heresy *ex cathedrâ;* (2.) that his condemnation was sanctioned by Leo II. in those very terms. But it is impossible to prove either of these two heads. The Sixth Council, as we have seen above, accepted as a dogmatic definition the Letter of Pope Agatho, and with it the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; it cannot then have condemned Honorius for having taught heresy *ex cathedrâ.* A self-contradiction such as this would be quite impossible; especially when we consider that the Fathers adhered to Agatho's Letter by solemn acts, not only before, but also after their resolution in the case of Honorius. For example, by their synodical letter to the Pope,[684] and by their Prosphonetic address to the Emperor.[685] Besides, the contrary view has no ground whatever, either in the Acts of the Council or any external testimony. So that it may be safely asserted that the Sixth Council did not condemn Honorius for having taught heresy in the Church.[686] As to Leo II., who

[684] *Litteræ Sextæ Synodi ad Agathonem Papam.* In Act. xviii., Conc. vi. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 1109).

[685] *Sermo Prosphoneticus ad Imperatorem.* In Act. xviii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1089).

[686] See *Pope Honorius*, sec. iv., p. 92, seq.

sanctioned the Sixth Synod, and gave it its rank among the Ecumenical Councils, we have proved elsewhere that he confirmed nothing but its definition of faith.[687] It is true that in this definition the name of Honorius is mentioned among those who were condemned by the Synod. But in what sense did the Pope confirm the condemnation? His three Letters addressed to the Emperor Constantine, to the Bishops of Spain, and to the King Ervigius, will tell us most unmistakably. He wrote to Constantine as follows: "Likewise we anathematise the inventors of the new error: Theodore, Bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, traitors, rather than rulers of the Church of Constantinople. Moreover Honorius also, who did not endeavour to preserve pure the Apostolic Church by the doctrine of the Apostolic tradition, but permitted (παρεχώρησε) the immaculate to be defiled by profane betrayal."[688] It is evident that Pope Leo draws a broad line of demarcation between the inventors of the error, the betrayers of their Episcopal and Patriarchal Churches, and Pope Honorius. Of the last Leo asserts, (1.) that he did not do what he should have done to preserve pure the Apostolic Church by the doctrine of the Apostolic tradition; and (2.) that he permitted the immaculate to be defiled by profane betrayal. Now it is true that when criticism on the case of Honorius was little advanced, some of the champions of the Pope referred to him the words "profane betrayal" (τῇ βεβήλῳ προδοσίᾳ). Mgr. Maret, without any further inquiry, understands them in the same way.[689] Mr. Renouf,[690]

[687] *Pope Honorius*, p. 109, seq.

[688] *Relatio Leonis Papæ II. ad Constantin. Imper.* (Labbe, t. vii., p. 1156).

[689] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. viii., n. viii., p. 291.

[690] *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 13, in note; *The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered*, p. 60, seq.

and before him Dr. Döllinger,[691] have done the same. But Dr. Döllinger tortured the verb παραχωρέω so as to make it give the meaning of positively adhering; and he founded on this word his assertion that Honorius really adhered to the error of the Monothelites. Mr. Renouf, following in the steps of the Munich historian, remarks that "the words προδοσίᾳ βεβήλῳ μιανθῆναι παρεχώρησε imply a surrender of the faith as complete as if Leo had directly said that Honorius polluted the Church by his heresy."[692] But even granting that the words "by profane betrayal" refer to Honorius, the sentence would by no means countenance anything like that which Mr. Renouf infers from it. A Pope who permits the Church to be polluted, is most grievously guilty in the discharge of his Pastoral ministry: the fold of Christ is committed to his guardianship; if therefore by his positive negligence, he permits the wolves to rush into the fold and slaughter the sheep, his fault is like to a treason, and to a profane treason, because the office of Supreme Pastor in the Church had been divinely intrusted to him. This was, apparently, the fault of Pope Honorius; for this he was really condemned by the Sixth Council. In this sense, and in this alone, some of his apologists have referred to him the words "by profane betrayal." Any other meaning which Mr. Renouf or others would attribute to these writers is disclaimed by them, and has no solid ground to rest upon.

Nevertheless, the fact is that the words in question ought not to be referred to Pope Honorius, but to Sergius and the rest of the Monothelite faction. Mr. Renouf, with his usual boldness, ascribes want of scholarship to those who refer these words to the authors of the Monothelite error; but we believe that

[691] *Papst Fabeln*, p. 138.
[692] *The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered*, p. 61.

this time the grammarian has forgotten his grammar. What argument can he allege for his assertion? He does not mention any reason at all, nor could he do so. Not only does the Greek text perfectly bear that meaning, but it even requires it, on account of the manifest antithesis between the words ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως ἁγνίσαι, and βεβήλῳ προδοσίᾳ μιανθῆναι.[693] Pope Honorius neglected to illustrate the Apostolic Church with the doctrine of the Apostolic tradition, and he permitted it to be polluted by the profane heresy of the Monothelites. In this explanation nothing is forced or strained; all is easy and natural. The word *permitted* (παρεχώρησε), which of itself yields a negative notion, is in perfect harmony with the rest of the sentence. Again this word implies absence or want of action: and therefore evidently shows that the expression τῇ βεβήλῳ προδοσίᾳ, which does express action, is to be applied to a different subject. On this account, if Honorius, in the opinion of Leo II., had so acted as directly to pollute the Church by his heresy, then the word *permitted* should be entirely expunged from the passage. Moreover, Pope Leo, some lines before the words in question, calls the Monothelite Bishops ὑποκαθιστὰς μᾶλλον ἤπερ καθηγητάς:[694] that is to say, he terms them traitors, lying in ambush in order to corrupt

[693] Father Franzelin in his treatise, *De Verbo Incarnato* (thes. xi., p. 519), remarks to the purpose, that "Profana proditio est hæresis Sergii et Cyri opposita Apostolicæ traditioni, ut ex antithesi in verbis Græcis est manifestissimum."

[694] The word ὑποκαθιστάς might be derived from ὑποκαθέζεσθαι —*subsidere per insidias* (Suidas ad v., *In Lexico*, t. ii., p. 1363. Edit. Halis, 1853). It seems that St. Leo could have called these Prelates "traitors and plotters rather than Pastors," more properly than "successors rather than Pastors," as the Latin interpreter has rendered the passage. The *glossa* followed the first meaning, and the editors of the Councils have preserved it in the margin of their editions.

the purity of the faith. The words "profane betrayal," which follow closely, must have reference only to those of whom he had spoken before in similar terms. Finally, if Pope Leo had referred those words to Honorius, in the sense of Mr. Renouf and Dr. Döllinger, he would have contradicted himself, for in the other two Letters he makes the cause of the condemnation of Honorius quite distinct from that of the heretics, and clearly rests it on that Pontiff's omission to extinguish at its outset the flame of the heretical error, as required by the dignity of the Apostolic authority, and on the negligence which fostered that heresy.[695] Leo spoke thus in his Letter to the Bishops of Spain, where he evidently distinguished the cause of Honorius from that of the Monothelite Bishops of the East, whom he called "perduelliones adversum Apostolicæ traditionis puritatem." In the other Letter to King Ervigius, after having mentioned the condemnation of all the authors of heretical assertion, as Sergius, Theodore, &c., he continues—"Et unâ cum eis Honorius Romanus, qui immaculatam Apostolicæ traditionis regulam quam a prædecessoribus suis accepit, maculari consensit."[696] Evidently Leo II., in this as well as in the preceding

[695] The whole passage is as follows:—"Qui flamman hæretici dogmatis, non ut decuit Apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit" (*Epist.* ii. *Leonis II. ad Episcopos Hispaniæ.* Labbe, t. vii., p. 1456).

[696] "Omnes hæreticæ assertionis auctores, venerando censente concilio condemnati de Catholicæ Ecclesiæ adunatione projecti sunt, id est, Theodorus Pharanitanus Episcopus, Cyrus Alexandrinus, etc., et cum eis Honorius Romanus, qui immaculatam Apostolicæ traditionis regulam, quam a prædecessoribus suis accepit, maculari consensit, sed et Macarium, etc. . . . et omnes hi cum Ario, Apollinario, etc. . . . unam voluntatem unamque operationem prædicantes, doctrinam hæreticam impudenter defendere conabantur" (*Epist.* v. *Leonis II. ad Ervigium.* Labbe, l. c., p. 1462).

Letter, characterised the fault of Honorius in such a way as to exclude even the slightest adhesion to any error whatever. In the Letter to the Bishops of Spain, he charges his predecessor with negligence in the fulfilment of his duties, and attributes to this negligence the increase and spread of the flame of the heretical error. In Leo's Letter to Ervigius, Honorius is charged with like negligence, by which he allowed the immaculate rule of Apostolical tradition to be polluted by the new heresy of the Monothelites. Nor can any argument be drawn against the orthodoxy of Honorius from what Pope Leo says in the following words—"Omnes hi qui unam voluntatem unamque operationem prædicantes," &c.: for, as we said elsewhere,[697] Pope Leo included among the "omnes hi," &c., all those who had been "hæreticæ assertionis auctores." But he evidently excluded from this class Pope Honorius, and therefore did not include him among the "omnes hi." Had he intended to do so he would have contradicted his own assertion, because he could not say that Honorius had consented to the defilement of the Apostolical tradition if that Pope had been one of those who had endeavoured impudently to advocate and propagate an heretical doctrine.[698]

[697] *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. iv., p. 116, seq.

[698] Mr. Renouf in his second pamphlet on the case of Honorius (p. 61) repeats on this subject what he had said in the first (p. 5), passing over what had been said in answer to his objection in the book on Honorius by the present author (sec. iv., pp. 113—117). And still Mr. Renouf evidently intends to convey to the mind of his readers the persuasion that he destroyed every argument which had been produced by us in the fourth section of our book in favour of Honorius. In fact, further on he says—"Fr. Bottalla's concluding argument in favour of Pope Honorius remains to be exploded." Mr. Renouf should write another pamphlet in order to refute what we have said in that section in defence of Pope Honorius, before exploding its concluding argument.

From what we have said we must conclude that Pope Leo II., far from sanctioning any condemnation of Pope Honorius for the crime of heresy taught by him in the Church, pointedly excluded even the slightest adhesion on his part to any heresy whatever, and rested his condemnation on the ground of his grievous negligence in the discharge of his Pontifical duties. Even if the Sixth Council had declared Honorius guilty of heresy, its sentence would have been null and void if left without the Papal sanction. But we have proved elsewhere that no argument can be drawn from the Acts of the Sixth Synod in proof of any condemnation having been passed.[699] And the *Liber Diurnus* published by Garnier countenances our assertion.[700] The condemnation of Pope Honorius by the Sixth Council is, then, very far from being "utterly subversive of the theory of Papal Infallibility,"[701] because his Letters contain no heretical tenet, and the Council did not condemn him either for heretical teaching *ex cathedrâ*, or for any heresy whatever. Much less can the condemnation of Honorius, as renewed by the two Ecumenical Councils, the Seventh and the Eighth, create any difficulty. We have already fully explained this subject in our pamphlet on Honorius, to which we refer our readers.[702] We will only remark here (1.) that both these Synods, as we shall see in the next section, solemnly acknowledged the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; it is, then, impossible that they could condemn Honorius for having taught

[699] See *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. iv., pp. 95—108.

[700] *Ibid.*, p. 117, seq.

[701] Words of Mr. Renouf, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 7.

[702] *Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History*, sec. iv., pp. 129—136. Mr. Renouf, as usual, passes over what we have written on this subject in our pamphlet. This style of refutation is easy.

heresy in the Church. (2.) The Seventh Synod says nothing which can be construed into a condemnation for heresy; the Eighth did not intend to pronounce any new condemnation against Honorius, but to repeat what had been decreed in the Sixth Council; its words, therefore, cannot have any other meaning than that which is conveyed in the decision of the Sixth Synod.

It now only remains for us to say a word on the passage concerning Honorius' condemnation which we find in the old Roman Breviary. This trifling difficulty was very strongly urged by Mr. Renouf in his first pamphlet, and now by F. Gratry. We examined it at length in our pamphlet on Pope Honorius, and our readers may look there for a full explanation on the matter.[703] We will subjoin here only a few remarks. (1.) No wonder can be felt if an historical mistake occurs in a lesson of the old Breviary. No one has ever maintained that the lessons of the Roman Breviary are the fruit of the best criticism. In the work just referred to, we have inquired into the source from which the lesson was taken, and have shown the cause of the mistake; we found it in a conjunctive particle shifted from its proper place. In it we read—"In quâ (Synodo) condemnati sunt Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, etc., sed et Polychronius, novus et Simon, qui unam voluntatem et operationem in D. N. J. C. dixerunt, etc." Now the correct reading would be as follows—"Sed et Polychronius, *novus Simon*, et qui unam voluntatem, etc.," exactly as in the second Letter of Leo II. to the Emperor Constantine,[704] and in the second profession of faith in the *Liber Diurnus*.[705] That particle being placed as in those two documents, the words "qui unam, etc.," would no

[703] Sec. iv., pp. 122—129.

[704] In Labbe, t. vii., p. 1156.

[705] *Liber Diurnus*, cap. ii., secunda professio fidei (Migne, t. cv., *PP. LL.*, pp. 52, 53).

longer affect the names of the persons condemned, and consequently no difficulty would arise from finding in that category the name of Honorius. (2.) When the Breviary was corrected by the order of the Council of Trent, it was necessary to expunge from that lesson the name of Honorius, whom ignorant readers might have believed to have been condemned for heresy, on account of being found in the same list with Sergius, Cyrus, etc. Those who make much of this difficulty against the orthodoxy of the accused Pope, exaggerate, on the one hand, the authority of the Breviary with regard to historical correctness, and, on the other hand, they disregard the economical governing power of the Church.

And now to end. The condemnation of Pope Honorius is no difficulty in the way of Papal Infallibility, and the Sixth Council affords some of the clearest testimonies in its support. The Fathers of the Sixth Synod fully adhered to the dogmatic definitions which had already been pronounced by five Popes; they accepted as a definition of faith, and as the Word of God, the Letters of Pope Agatho, and with them the dogma of Papal Infallibility.

SECTION XII.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH GENERAL COUNCILS.

THE Seventh and the Eighth Ecumenical Councils, no less than the preceding, stand forth as plainly favourable to Papal Infallibility. The Seventh Synod was called by Hadrian I. against the sect of the Iconoclasts, who, in the course of one hundred and twenty years of the most cruel persecution against the worshippers of sacred images, shed more blood, and caused more evils and scandals in the Church than any of the preceding factions. Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymus made up their minds that no means were to be left untried for extirpating the veneration of images, and for freeing the Church from what they termed idolatry. They spared no kind of cruelty in order to succeed in their impious purpose. Exile and confiscation were the mildest punishments which the heroes of faith could expect at the hands of those cruel tyrants. By hundreds they were cut to pieces, or cast in bags into the sea, or horribly mutilated, or condemned to die of misery and starvation. Constantine Copronymus, availing himself of the utter degradation of a great part of the Clergy in the East, convened a Synod of 338 Bishops at Constantinople, and forced them to bow, against their conscience, in servile compliance to his will. In such a state of things the Catholic portion of the Eastern Church did not see any gleam of hope except from Rome, from the Apos-

tolic See. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, having steadily resisted the attempts of the Emperor, addressed himself to Pope Gregory II. for help and support. The great Pontiff, in a Letter to the Patriarch, gave a clear exposition of the Catholic dogma concerning the veneration of the sacred images, and defined what every Catholic was to believe on the subject.[706] The same Pope, in two other Letters to the Emperor Leo, strongly reproached him for his cruelty and iniquity;[707] stigmatised him as a heretic for having destroyed the images of Christ and of the Saints;[708] and rejected the proposal of a General Council on a subject which was already more clear than light itself.[709] He strongly inculcated on him that it is a duty of the Emperors to obey the definitions of the Pontiff—not to command in matters of faith.[710] He threatened him with the judgments of God, no less than with the indignation of his own subjects in the West.[711] Gregory II. not only set forth the Catholic dogma for the instruction of the Eastern Church, but also, in a Synod held at Rome, solemnly condemned and anathematised the error of the Iconoclasts.[712] His successors followed in his steps. Gregory III., Zachary,

[706] *Epist. Gregorii II. Papæ ad Germanum Patr. Const.* In Act. iv., Conc. Niceni ii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 931, seq.).

[707] *Epist.* i. *Gregorii II. ad Leonem Isaur.* In Actis Conc. Nic. ii., cap. i. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 651, seq.); *Epist.* ii. *ejusdem ad eundem* (l. c., p. 667, seq.). Mgr. Maret, by mistake, ascribes these Letters to Gregory III., his successor.

[708] "Expediret tibi, imperator, ut hæreticus potius quam persecutor et eversor historiarum et picturarum et imaginum et passionum Domini appellareris?" (*Epist.* i. *Ibid.*, p. 959).

[709] "Tu ea quæ cognita sunt et spectata ut lumen, aperte insectatus es" (*Ibid.*). "Scripsisti ut concilium universale cogeretur, et nobis inutilis ea res visa est" (*Ibid.*, p. 662).

[710] *Epist.* i. (l. c., p. 662); *Epist.* ii. (l. c., p. 670, seq.).

[711] *Epist.* i. (l. c., p. 663, seq.).

[712] Conc. iii. Rom. sub Greg. II. (Labbe, t. xlii., p. 191). The Greek writers, as Cedrenus, Zonaras, etc., all confirm this fact.

Paul I., Stephen II., and Stephen III., all definitively condemned the new heresy, and pronounced an anathema against those who were defiled by it.[713] After the Pontifical Acts, the controversy concerning sacred images must be considered as being definitively settled as a matter of doctrine. Nevertheless, after sixty years of cruel persecution, the Oriental Church was so far thrown into confusion, and the scandals and evils had increased to so great an extent, as to require an Ecumenical Council. After the virtuous resignation of the Patriarch Paul, Tarasius courageously refused to accept the Patriarchal See of Constantinople except on the condition that the consent of the Pope were obtained to the convocation of a General Synod, and that the Oriental Church should be freed from the anathema under which it was lying, and restored to the unity of one faith and one body.[714] The Emperor Constantine and his mother Irene willingly consented to the request of the newly-elected Patriarch,[715] and, in pursuance of it, the Emperors joined with Tarasius in addressing their prayers to Pope Hadrian I., begging him to assemble an Ecumenical Council for the purpose of bringing back the Eastern provinces to peace and concord.[716] The Patriarch at the same time forwarded to the Roman Pontiff a Catholic profession of faith, and an apology for the veneration of the sacred images.[717] Hadrian I. received these Letters with heartfelt joy. He immediately dispatched his Legates to Constantinople, in

[713] *Hadriani Epist. ad Carolum M.* In Synod. Nic. ii., cap. v. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 1381, et etiam Labbe, t. viii., pp. 218, 483, etc.).

[714] *Sacra Constantini et Irenis Imp.* In Conc. Nic. ii., Act. i. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 698).

[715] *Ibid.*

[716] *Sacra* cit. (l. c., p. 699); *Historia Miscella*, l. xxiii. (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. xcv., p. 1116).

[717] Cedrenus, *Historiarum Compendium*, t. ii., p. 22 (Edit. Bonn); *Hist. Misc.*, l. c., p. 1117.

order that they might settle, with the Emperor and the Patriarch, the easiest way of putting an end to the prevailing heresy.[718] At the same time he wrote to the Emperor a very important Letter, which was read in the Second Session of the Seventh Synod. In it he accedes to the scheme of summoning an Ecumenical Council, but he requires, as a preliminary step, that the pseudo-Synod which had been held against the sacred images by Constantine Copronymus should be solemnly condemned and anathematised in the presence of his Legates.[719] He points out to the Emperors the sublime dignity and power of the Roman See, in which the supreme authority of the Prince of the Apostles still survived, and to which was intrusted the care of feeding the flock of Christ. He informs them that in the Roman See the Apostolical traditions had always been preserved in their integrity and perfection, and that from the same See the practical rule of faith had been spread abroad to the Faithful of every tongue and nation.[720] He reminds them of the devotion with which their predecessors had always venerated the Roman Church and sincerely submitted to its Decrees.[721] Accordingly he exhorts them to remain firm in their loyal obedience to the Roman Church, and to restore to honour and veneration those sacred images, which the violence of impious and heretical men had cast away through all the cities of the Empire.[722] At the same time the Pope addressed another Letter to Tarasius. In this he approves of the Patriarch's Catholic profession of

[718] *Sacra Constantini* (l. c.); *Epist. Tarasii Patr. ad Hadrianum Papam* (Labbe, t. viii., p. 1275).

[719] *Epist. Hadriani Papæ ad Imperatores* (Labbe, t. viii., p. 763).

[720] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 747).

[721] *Ibid.* (l. c.).

[722] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 761).

faith.[723] He pointedly declares the doctrine of the Iconoclasts to be an error and heresy, and he gives the names of impious and heretics to its supporters; on the other side he solemnly defines the opposite doctrine to be the dogma and the tradition of all Christian antiquity.[724] This being so, he authoritatively imposes on the Patriarch the duty of persuading the Emperor to declare the pseudo-Synod which had been held against the sacred images to be void of effect. "For," he goes on, "it is written—'The gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church;' and again—'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I shall build My Church.'"[725] Finally, the Pope intimates to the Patriarch that, unless the sacred images again received their traditional worship, and he himself faithfully adhered to the dogmatic truth, his consecration would not be recognised at Rome.[726]

Now Mgr. Maret and the Gallican School maintain that, though the character of the controversy was clear, the Letters of Hadrian I. did not constitute an irreformable and absolute rule of faith before they were accepted and signed by the Synod; so that the controversy could not have an end without the aid of an Ecumenical Council.[727] The question recurs in the same terms at each Council. The Letters of Pope Hadrian I. were, in truth, by themselves a rule of faith, and moreover evidently supposed that the rule of faith had already been made known to the Catholic world by the dogmatical definitions of his predecessors. In fact, Hadrian expressly requires that Tarasius should "Nostræ Apos-

[723] *Epistola Hadriani I. ad Tarasium Patr.* In Act. ii., Conc. vii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 767, seq.).

[724] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 771, seq.), et etiam *Epist. ad Imp.* (l. c., p. 762).

[725] *Ibid.* (l. c.).

[726] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 774).

[727] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. ix., p. vi., pp. 308, 311, seq.

tolicæ sedis sacram et orthodoxam formam ex profundo cordis et sinceritate mentis custodire."[728] That is to say, the Patriarch is required to submit implicitly to the definition of faith which had been pronounced by the Apostolical See in relation to the veneration of the sacred images. The words cannot yield any other meaning; since the Patriarch is called upon to render a perfect submission of his reason and of his will to the doctrine of the Roman See, and the Pontiff assigns as reason of his claim the orthodoxy of his doctrine. Now no such obedience could be required by a Pontiff from a Patriarch of the second see in the Church, on the eve of an Ecumenical Council, unless the doctrine were already a rule of faith, nor unless the See which had defined it were infallible. In no other view can we understand how the Pope could express his desire that no Council should assemble until after the solemn rejection of the pseudo-Synod which had condemned the veneration of the sacred images. In no other view could the Pope repeatedly give the names of heresy and heretic to the doctrine and its followers, nor could he refuse to recognise the new Patriarch until he had restored the veneration of the sacred images in his Church. All these clauses of the Letter prove that in the persuasion of the Pope the rule of faith existed already independently of the Ecumenical Council, and that its existence was owing to the decision already pronounced in the matter by his own predecessors. But why then, it will be asked, did he consent to the convocation of a General Council? The answer to this question is found in the very Letter of Pope Hadrian to the Emperor. "Si impossibile est," he says,

[728] *Epist. Hadriani ad Tarasium* (l. c., p. 774). τὸν αὐτῆς (the Apostolic See) ἱερὸν καὶ ὀρθόδοξον τύπον ἀφθάρτως καὶ ἀμολύντως ἐκ βάθους καρδίας καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς διανοίας φυλάξαι ἐπιτηδεύσῃ: κ.τ.λ.

"hæreticorum vesania, pro incredulitate ipsorum ipsas sacras ac venerandas imagines sine Synodi actione in pristino erigere ac confirmare statu, et nostros sacerdotes pro hujusmodi pia operatione vestra cupit serenissima imperialis potentia accersire," etc. We here see that the reason why the Pope consented to call a General Council was not the settlement of the doctrinal controversy, but on account of the incredulous obstinacy of the heretics, which would be proof against all other means, but which would probably yield to the authority of a large and imposing assembly of Bishops. The Seventh Council is again another instance of the merciful economy of the Church towards heretics, whom, when other means are exhausted, she endeavours either to convert by the authoritative and united testimony of the whole body of the Catholic Bishops, or at least to render inoffensive to the great mass of Catholics.

But we must see what view was expressed by the Fathers of the Seventh Synod. The very same as we have been maintaining. In the First Session of the Council, before any discussion had taken place on the subject of sacred images, some of the Bishops, who had signed the decree of Copronymus, repenting of their crime, presented to the Council the *Libelli* of their faith, in order to secure their own union with the centre of Catholic unity. All these, together with the assembled Fathers, clearly declared that they ought to be received in the same manner as converts who return from heresy;[729] and the Canons of the Church and the

[729] Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, said in his *Libellus* presented to the Council—"Legislatio est ecclesiastica . . . ut ab hæresi quacumque ad orthodoxam confessionem et traditionem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ conversi in scriptis suam obnegent hæresim et fidem confiteantur orthodoxam. Unde et ego Basilius . . . in scriptis offero," etc. (In Act. i., Conc. vii. Labbe, t. viii., p. 699). This was the language used by the Bishops who were looking for reconcili-

testimonies of the Fathers were produced and read in the Synod, showing the manner in which heretics should be reconciled when returning to the Church.[730] We are forced, then, to conclude that, in the general persuasion of the Synod, to condemn the veneration of the sacred images was regarded as a heresy, and that they who had professed it were looked upon as heretics, and dealt with accordingly.[731] It follows that the rule of faith was fixed and infallibly known long before the controversy had been examined, and before the Decree had been enacted against the error of Leo the Isaurian and his successors. This being so, it must be admitted that the Letters of Pope Hadrian were received by the Council without any examination to see whether they were in accordance with the doctrine of the Fathers and of the Councils. The doctrine which Hadrian I. advocated in his Letters as a doctrine of faith, was already regarded by the assembled Fathers as an irreformable dogma long before the Letters had been read in the Council; the examination which was instituted is to be ascribed to the constant practice of Synods, as we have already often had occasion to remark. This practice does not the least contradict the persuasion of the Fathers concerning the infallible authority of the document which they examine.

ation with the Church; they regarded their error a heresy, and therefore they made their recantation in writing, according to the ancient rule of the Church. Moreover, when the Patriarch Tarasius asked the Monks who were present in the Synod, what was their opinion on the subject of receiving the Bishops who had signed the decrees against the sacred images, they answered —"Quemadmodum sanctæ et universales Synodi susceperunt ex hæresi conversos, et nos suscipimus" (*Ibid.*, l. c., p. 707). And "Sancta Synodus dixit: Placet omnibus nobis." Consequently, this was the view of the whole Council.

[730] In Act. i., Conc. vii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 711, seq., p. 731, seq.).

[731] *Ibid.* (l. c., pp. 710, 714, 718, etc.).

But a further remark must be here made upon the subject. When the Papal Legates officially asked the Patriarch of Constantinople whether he accepted the two Letters of Pope Hadrian which had then been just read, Tarasius answered by quoting the words of St. Paul to the Romans — "Fides vestra annuntiatur in universo mundo."[732] Upon which he continued—"It is necessary to follow this testimony, and he who opposes it acts unwisely. Therefore Hadrian, Bishop of the older Rome, being a partaker with those whom that testimony concerns, wrote with distinctness and truth to our pious Emperors and to our Humility, asserting that the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church was good and right."[733] Afterwards he adds in confirmation—"And we also, having examined the Letters, by searching the Scriptures, and by reasoning, and remaining faithful to the doctrines of the Fathers, according as we have confessed, confess it now and will always confess," etc.[734] All the Synod concurred in what was said by Tarasius; and the question being put by the Papal Legates whether the Fathers would accept the Letters of Pope Hadrian, the unanimous answer was — "We follow them, we accept them, we admit them."[735]

Now the meaning of the answer of Tarasius is clearly not that he admitted the Papal Letters simply because he had found their doctrine to be in accordance with the Scripture and Tradition: this reason was a form merely of confirming his unreserved adhesion to them; but his adhesion rested entirely on the principle of the infallibility of the Apostolical See. He expressly declared that it was necessary to follow the

[732] Rom. i. 8.
[733] Act. ii., Conc. vii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 774, seq.).
[734] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 775).
[735] *Ibid.*

testimony of the Apostle: that is to say, to agree with the faith of the Apostolical See. But since Hadrian was one of those who had a share in the testimony of the Apostle, as his teaching exhibited the character of clearness and truth, it was fitting that all should agree with it. Tarasius expressed in other terms what St. Irenæus had pointed out when he said: "Ad hanc Ecclesiam (Romanam) propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam."[736] When afterwards the Patriarch added that as he had found the Papal doctrine to be in harmony with that of the Scriptures and of the Fathers, he acted in conformity with a duty which devolves on every Ecumenical Synod. In fact, the dogmatical definition of faith concerning the worship of the sacred images was not pronounced before the Seventh Session of the Council; and for five Sessions the Synod found full occupation in examining passages of Scripture and of the Fathers, and in refuting the arguments of the Iconoclasts; so that though they had declared the doctrine of Hadrian's Letters to be the Catholic doctrine, and that of the Iconoclasts to be a heresy, they undertook a thorough examination of the whole controversy before pronouncing their final sentence. We see from this that a doctrine may be held by a Synod as a dogma of faith, and nevertheless be carefully examined before it is defined; the object being both to confirm the doctrine and to resist the wiles of the heretics who sought to prove its falsity. We must again conclude that the Seventh Council, no less than the preceding ones, followed the definition already pronounced by the Apostolical See, and adhered to its infallible *magisterium.*

Before turning our attention to the Eighth Ecumenical Council, we must say a word with reference to the opposition which the Second Synod of Nicæa

[736] See sec. iii., p. 62, seq.

encountered in France under Charlemagne. It is certain that at the time when the heresy of the Iconoclasts first arose, no less than twelve French Bishops subscribed their names to the Synods called in Rome by Stephen III. in favour of the veneration of the sacred images.[737] Consequently it cannot be said that the French Clergy condemned the Catholic doctrine respecting the relative worship due to the images of the Saints. Neither did they show any disregard of the authority of the Holy See. For they erroneously believed that Pope Hadrian had not accepted and sanctioned the Synod, and it is true that the Roman Pontiff, although he had received the Synod, had nevertheless abstained from sanctioning it in a solemn manner.[738] He did not send round any circular Letters on the subject to all the Catholic provinces; so that until the age of the Second Hadrian and of the Eighth General Council, six Ecumenical Councils only were numbered in the Church.[739] There is then no ground for wonder if the Decrees of Nicæa were submitted to examination and to censure by the French Bishops in the Synod of Frankfort, as well as in the six *Libri Carolini* which some French Bishops wrote at that time and sent to Pope Hadrian I. The particular mistake made by these Bishops is more easily understood when we remember that the Latin translation of the Acts of the Council of Nicæa which had been sent to France was very imperfect, and in some passages was

[737] Synodus Rom. sub Stephano III. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 483).; Pap. Hadrianus, in *Epistola ad Carolum M. pro Nicæna* ii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 1581).

[738] *Epist. Hadriani ad Carolum M. pro Synodo Nic.* (Labbe, t. viii., p. 1598).

[739] Vide *Epist.* xxxiv. *Hadriani Papæ II. ad Carolum Calvum* (Labbe, t. x., p. 443). Pope Hadrian mentions only the Council of Nicæa and the five following.

so adulterated as to make the Council give to the sacred images the worship which is due to the Holy Trinity alone.[740] While, therefore, the Synod of Frankfort permitted the use of the sacred images in and out of the churches, in its Second Canon, it forbade them to be adored with the worship due to the Most Holy Trinity.[741] Nevertheless, Pope Hadrian, who had privately received and sanctioned the Seventh Council, wrote at length in its favour, answering the objections raised against it in the *Libri Carolini.*[742] The form in which he wrote was a Letter to Charlemagne. He showed that the definition of the Council upon the veneration of images was not justly liable to any censure. This Letter put an end to the controversy. The short sketch of the history which we have given suggests some few remarks. (1.) The question of Papal Infallibility was no way touched, nor that of the relative positions of Pope and Council: this is clear from the history. (2.) The opposition to the Synod of Nicæa originated in want of knowledge of the original text. The adulteration of the Latin translation concerns principally the words used in the Seventh Synod by Constantine, Bishop of Cyprus. According to the Latin version, it seemed as if he had maintained the duty of giving the same worship of adoration to the images

[740] Baronius and Bellarmine thought that the Synod of Frankfort condemned the entire Second Council of Nicæa; but we cannot follow their opinion, which is opposed to the clearest proofs. See in the matter the Dissertation of Father Losurius (In Labbe, t. ix., p. 113, seq.); Orsi, *De Auct. Rom. Pontif.*, l. i., cap. xxxi., art. iii., pt. ii., t. i., p. 21. Rome, 1771.

[741] In Conc. Francofordiensi, Can. ii. (Labbe, t. ix., p. 101). The doctrine condemned in this Canon, is just the same which the Seventh Council condemned. But the Latin version brought into France was corrupted.

[742] *Epist. Hadriani ad Carolum M. pro Synodo Nicæna* ii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 1554, seq.).

of the Saints as was given to the Holy Trinity.[743] (3.) The Bishops of France considered themselves at liberty to censure the Synod of Nicæa, because they regarded it as a particular Synod of the Greeks, devoid of any Pontifical sanction, as appears from the Second Canon of Frankfort. (4.) Finally, no difficulty against Papal Infallibility is created by the Assembly of Paris under Louis Debonnaire, when some Bishops ventured to accuse Pope Hadrian of having favoured the Greek superstition; nor by the fact of Claudius, Bishop of Turin, having removed all images from the churches of his diocese. It is not altogether unknown in the Church that some Bishops, carried away either by pride or by ignorance, or by both together, have lifted up their voice against Ecumenical Councils and Popes. As to the Spaniard Claudius, he was evidently an Iconoclast, who succeeded in introducing the poison of that heresy into the Italian soil.

Nevertheless, the Second Council of Nicæa did not root out the evils of the Eastern Church. A powerful party of Iconoclasts still existed in the capital of the Empire. When Leo the Armenian obtained the imperial diadem, this party became possessed of power, and were left free to exercise their vengeance and to set on foot a most cruel persecution against the worshippers of the sacred images. For twenty-seven years the Catholics were scourged, tortured, mutilated, beheaded, cast into the sea, or kept in the most loathsome prisons in order to prolong their cruel agony. Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, the great hero of the day, solemnly declared that he would never swerve from the guiding principle of the Apostolical See, which is divinely

[743] Constantinus, Bishop of Cyprus, had said just the contrary—*τὴν κατὰ λατρείαν προσκύνησιν μόνῃ τῇ ὑπερουσίῳ καὶ ζωαρχικῇ τριάδι ἀναπέμπω* (Act. iii., Conc. Nic. ii. Labbe, t. viii., p. 836).

instructed, and without which no synodical doctrine can ever be regarded of faith.[744] Moreover, Theodore the Studite, one of the most learned and powerful champions of the Catholic dogma, though in chains and cruelly tormented, did not see any other means fit to counteract the fury of the persecution than to address himself to that Apostolic See "which had been from the beginning the genuine fountain of orthodox truth."[745] Pope Paschal was not negligent in the discharge of his Pastoral duties, and following in the steps of Gregory II. and Hadrian I., he addressed to Leo the Armenian a Letter, explaining and defending the Catholic dogma of the worship of the sacred images, and pointing out the true view to be taken of it.[746] Although the Letter of the Pope did not put a stop to the cruel persecution, which was still carried on by Leo and his successor, still it contributed to strengthen the faith in the hearts of the people, and to furnish them with sure weapons in defence of the dogma sanctioned at Nicæa. Theodore the Studite, and Methodius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, spoke of this Letter in terms of the highest praise, and attributed to it the salvation of many.[747] But the terrible evils caused by the Iconoclasts in the Eastern Church had not yet been stayed by the zealous efforts of the Patriarch Methodius, and of his holy successor Ignatius, when a new scandal sprang up in the Church of Constantinople, which was destined

[744] *Epist. ad Leonem III. Papam* (Labbe, t. ix., p. 292, seq.); *Apologeticus pro SS. Imaginibus* (Migne, *PP. GG.*, t. c., p. 597).

[745] *Epist.*, l. ii., Epp. xii., xiii., p. 1151, seq., p. 1154, seq. (Edit. Migne, t. xcix., *PP. GG.*).

[746] A portion of this Letter was discovered by Pitra in the library of the Roman College. He published it in his *Jus Eccl. Græcum*, t. ii., p. xi., seq.

[747] Theodorus Studita, *Epist.*, l. ii., Ep. lxiii., p. 1282 (Edit. Migne, t. xcix., *PP. GG.*); Methodius, *Ex Novis Epist.*, a Card. Maio editis, Epp. 192, 193 (Penes Pitra, Op. cit., l. c., p. x.).

shortly to destroy whatever remained of Catholic faith and unity in the Oriental Church, and to bring it headlong into fatal schism. The Emperor Michael and his ambitious courtier Photius were the authors of this great scandal; the former by deposing the Patriarch Ignatius, and raising to the Patriarchal see a layman and a soldier; the latter by usurping the Episcopal Chair in defiance of all the Canons of the Church and of all principles of justice. Ignatius applied to the Roman Pontiff for redress, and was in revenge treated with the utmost cruelty by the usurper and his imperial protector. But Pope Nicholas, having made himself acquainted with the case, held a Synod in Rome, when he published a sentence of anathema and deposition against the invader, and ordered the restoration of the true Patriarch Ignatius to the see of Constantinople. But Photius, supported by the Emperor Michael, not only refused to obey the order of the Roman Pontiff, but also convened an assembly of Bishops in Constantinople, and like a new Dioscorus, pronounced an anathema against the Pope. Before long, however, Michael was murdered, and Basil thereupon became undisputed Emperor of the East; he drove Photius from his usurped see, and restored Ignatius according to the orders of Pope Nicholas.[748]

It was then that the necessity of a new Ecumenical Council was generally felt, to bring order and discipline into the Oriental Church. Nicholas I. had consented to the convocation of the Synod, but was prevented by death from seeing the Assembly. Hadrian II., his successor, in a Roman Synod, renewed the sentence of anathema and deposition against Photius;[749] but willingly accepted the proposal of a General Council,

[748] See pt. i. of this work, on the *Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. v., p. 128, seq.

[749] In *Vita Hadriani II.* (Labbe, t. x., p. 392, seq.); in *Allocutione Hadriani II.* In Act. vii., Conc. viii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 594).

and sent his Legates to Constantinople to preside over the Assembly. The careful study of the Acts of the Council shows plainly that all the endeavours of the Apostolic See were directed to strengthen the ties which bound the Eastern Church in dutiful submission to the Roman Pontiff; whence it follows that we find in this Council some of the strongest proofs of the divine supremacy of the Pope in the Church. This is seen and admitted by the older Gallicans and by Mgr. Maret.[750] But they do not see with equal clearness that this same Synod furnishes a convincing argument for the superiority of the Pope over every Council, and for the irreformability of his dogmatic decisions. We must study brevity, and shall therefore confine ourselves to the principal heads of the argument, referring for details to the works of Cardinal Orsi,[751] and of Muzzarelli,[752] The points on which we touch shall be those which Mgr. Maret has attacked.

Our attention is first claimed by the formula of faith which Pope Hadrian II., without any previous discussion, ordered to be signed by all the Bishops, and by such Photians as sought for reconciliation with the Church. The formula of faith, which we read in the First Session of the Council, consists of the formula sent by Hormisdas to the Orientals after the Acacian schism, with the addition required by the new state of things. Now Bossuet, in his famous Defence of the Gallican Declaration of 1682, makes no mention of this Act of the Eighth Council.[753] De la Luzerne faithfully

[750] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. x., n. ii., p. 316, seq.

[751] *De R. P. Auctoritate*, l. i., cap. xxxii., t. i., pt. ii., p. 32, seq.

[752] *De Auctoritate R. P. in Conc. Gen.*, cap. xii., sec. v., seq., t. ii., p. 283, seq.

[753] *Decl. Def. Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xii., cap. xxxii., t. ii., p. 203, seq. Edit. cit.

imitated the prudential silence of his master.[754] Mgr. Maret has not dared to abstain from all mention of this important fact; but he passes over it without the least remark, as if nothing could be drawn from it in favour of the Infallibility of the Pope, and of his superiority to General Councils.[755] And yet both Muzzarelli[756] and Orsi[757] develope at some length the argument in favour of the disputed Papal prerogatives which may be derived from the passage. Mgr. Maret simply takes no notice of what they have urged.

In the formula of faith, profession is made of the following heads of doctrine: (1.) The promises made to St. Peter are treated as having been made to his Successors, the Roman Pontiffs. (2.) The Apostolic See, according to these promises and as an effect of them, is always preserved immaculate in its religion, and its doctrine is recognised as holy, because in this See "integra est Christianæ Religionis soliditas."[758] (3.) A perfect submission is professed to all the Decrees of faith and discipline of the Roman Pontiffs, and especially to those of Pope Nicholas and Hadrian II.; so that, whosoever refuses entire obedience to these Decrees, is regarded as a schismatic who has no claim to be admitted to the communion of the Church.[759]

[754] *Sur la Déclaration de l'Assemblée du Clergé de France en* 1682, pt. iii., ch. xix., p. 299, seq. Paris, 1843.

[755] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. x., n. iii., p. 318, seq.

[756] *De Auctoritate R. P. in Conc. Gen.*, cap. xii., sec. 3, t. ii., p. 265, seq.

[757] Op. cit., l. c.

[758] *Libellus professionis fidei a Pontifice Romano missus.* In Act. i., Conc. viii. (Labbe, t. x., p. 498).

[759] "Ab hujus (Apostolicæ Sedis) fide et doctrina separari minime cupientes et præcipue SS. Sedis Apostolicæ præsulum sequentes in omnibus constituta, etc. Sequentes in omnibus Apostolicam Sedem et observantes ejus omnia constituta speramus ut in una communione quam Sedes Apostolica prædicat esse mereamur

(4.) Consequently, all the heresies and heretics are anathematised whom the Popes have condemned, and with these Photius, and Gregory, Bishop of Syracuse. Now who can deny that the dogma which we advocate is fully contained in these four heads of doctrine? The formula does not concern any particular dogma which the Pontiff presented to be adopted by the Synod, and which, according to the Gallican maxims, would become irreformable on the strength of the synodical signatures. The Apostolic See is represented in it as the solid and immoveable foundation of the whole Christian religion, as the test of orthodoxy, as the centre of unity in faith, divinely instituted in the Universal Church; and the privileges of this See are referred to divine promises. Now the Fathers of the Eighth Council, by adopting these doctrines, authentically declared, even according to Gallican principles, that they are infallible and Catholic dogmas, not mere opinions of an Ultramontane School. The Fathers, in fact, as soon as they were asked by the Papal Legates whether they would receive the *Libellus* forwarded by Pope Hadrian, answered unanimously that it was perfect and right, and that they therefore fully agreed with it.[760] In the Second Session the Bishops who had followed the example and doctrine of Photius were judged by the Papal Legates. The Legates alone order them to sign the profession of faith; they alone examine their cause, impose on them some penitential works in satisfaction for their sin of schism, and they alone restore them to their Episcopal dignity.

in qua est integra et vera Christianæ religionis soliditas: promittentes sequestratos a communione Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, idest non consentientes Sedi Apostolicæ, eorum nomina inter sacra non recitanda esse mysteria" (l. c., p. 497).

[760] "Tota Sancta Synodus exclamavit: Juste et convenienter lectus nobis libellus expositus est a Sancta Romanorum Ecclesia et propterea omnibus placet" (*Ibid.*, l. c., p. 500).

They command that for the future any other Bishops who, having been guilty of the same crime should repent of their guilt, are to be received in the same manner. Throughout the Session, the Council is a mere spectator of all that is done, everything being managed by the Roman Legates exclusively; these neither ask for the advice or the sanction of the assembled Fathers; in virtue of the authority received from the Roman Pontiff they judge independently of the whole Synod; they condemn and they absolve; and they impose on the Synod the obligation of dealing in the same manner for the future with penitent Bishops. The Synod makes no remark on what the Papal Legates do or say in the matter; no hint is found of any protest, but at the end of all, acclamations are given to the Legates and their work, and to the Pope whom they represent.[761] The bearing of all this will be fully appreciated when it is remembered that the absolute supremacy of the Pope over Bishops and Patriarchs was the very point called in question by Photius. In addition to the formulary of faith, the same Council received and adhered to the doctrine of several Letters written by Popes Nicholas and Hadrian. Let us see what principles these Letters contained. Nicholas I. had already, in his eighth Letter to the Emperor Michael, declared in a solemn manner that there was no authority in the Church which could stand superior to that of the Apostolic See. "Consequently," he continues, "no one was ever allowed to make any change in what this See had determined, nor to utter any contrary opinion;"[762] and in another of his Letters to the Emperor, which was read in the Council,

[761] Act. ii., Conc. viii. (Labbe, t. x., pp. 507—514).

[762] "Patet profecto Sedis Apostolicæ, cujus auctoritate major non est, judicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio" (*Epist.* viii. *Nicolai Papæ ad Michaelem Imp.* Labbe, t. ix., p. 1339).

he points out that, when anything has been settled by the Decrees of the Holy See, this is removed from all possibility of retractation and change.[763] He grounds the privileges of the Apostolic See on the promises which Christ made to the Head of the Apostles; so that his teaching is that the Apostolic See was divinely established as the solid rock of faith, and from it the rule of faith is to be expected in opposition to the madness of heretics.[764] In another Letter to Photius, likewise read in the Council, he confirms this assertion by the fact that the Universal Church seeks from the Roman See the doctrine and the integrity of the faith.[765] And he repeatedly inculcates the doctrine of the supreme and absolute jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff in the Universal Church.[766] Hadrian II. also, in his Letter to the Patriarch Ignatius, read in the Third Session of the Synod, speaks of the Letters of Pope Nicholas as divinely inspired, and mentions that according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, Decrees and judgments of the Apostolical See were not to be re-considered or examined; while the Canons also assert that the Roman See has the unlimited right to inquire into the affairs of others in the Church for the purpose of making any needful

[763] "Ut ejus (Romanæ Sedis) consultu, quæ ecclesiasticis conveniunt negotiis, agere curaverit; procul dubio quæ agenda vel ambigenda fuerint, irretractabiliter cuncta disponere, ordinare atque definire poterit," etc. (*Epist. Nicolai Papæ ad Michaelem Imp.* In Act. iv., Conc. viii. Labbe, t. x., p. 535).

[764] *Epist. Nicolai Papæ ad Michaelem Imp.* In Act. iv., Conc. viii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 529).

[765] "Universitas credentium ab hac Sancta Romana Ecclesia, quæ caput est omnium Ecclesiarum, doctrinam exquirit, integritatem fidei deposcit" (*Epist. Nicolai Papæ ad Photium.* In Act. iv., Conc. viii. Labbe, l. c., p. 539).

[766] *Epist. Nicolai Papæ ad Photium.* In Act. iv., Conc. viii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 540), and *passim* in the other Epistles of Nicholas inserted in that Session and in the Seventh.

reforms.[767] The Letters of Nicholas and Hadrian II., containing these views on the authority of the Roman Pontiff, being read in the presence of the Council, the Fathers not only gave no hint of any protest against what Mgr. Maret calls the absolute authority of the Pope, but they unanimously accepted and commended their teaching.

In the Third Session, when the Letters of Pope Hadrian were read, the Roman Legates asked the Synod whether or not these Letters were in accordance with the laws and the maxims of the Church. And the unanimous answer of the Council was in the affirmative.[768] Likewise in the Fourth and Seventh, but especially in the Fifth Session, when the Letters of Pope Nicholas were read, the Synod applauded, and judged the Pope worthy to be kept in everlasting remembrance in the Church.[769] Ignatius the Patriarch himself declared them to be in a perfect harmony with the synodical Canons, and informed the Council that the Emperor had perfectly followed all the definitions and the rules enacted by Pope Nicholas.[770] We gather from this that the Eighth Synod accepted and sanctioned all the maxims of both Popes Nicholas I. and Hadrian II. concerning the Constitution of the Church, and the supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable authority of the Roman Pontiff; and thus we have an easy retort against the Gallican School when they urge their

[767] "Nihil sequendum præter ejus (Nicolai) divinitus inspirata decreta conspicimus . . . Apostolicæ Sedis judicium nusquam præcipiunt sacri canones retractare, dum tamen censeant eum in aliorum quæque renovanda, seu definiendum negotia perscrutari" (*Epist. Hadriani Papæ ad Ignatium Patr.* In Act. iii., Conc. viii. Labbe, l. c., p. 520).

[768] In Act. iii., Conc. viii. (Labbe, t. x., p. 523).

[769] In Act. iv. (Labbe, l. c., p. 545); Act. v. (Labbe, l. c., p. 548); Act. vii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 605).

[770] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 604).

argument against the Papal authority and infallibility. They say that the Letters of the Popes Nicholas I. and Hadrian II. were accepted by the Council only after examination. Well, we reply, either with or without examination they were accepted. The Synod, therefore, fully acknowledged the superiority of the Pope over the General Council, the irreformability of his judgments, and his uncontrollable and unlimited jurisdiction in the whole Church, whether dispersed or assembled in an Ecumenical Synod.

It now only remains to examine in the shortest possible manner the last assertion of Mgr. Maret on the condemnation of Photius pronounced by the Eighth Council. Bossuet could not refrain from remarking that the Eighth Synod did literally execute the sentence of Nicholas I. and Hadrian II. in the condemnation of Photius.[771] Mgr. Maret does not quote this passage, but rests on an earlier chapter, in which the contradictory view is taken.[772] De la Luzerne treats the matter in the same way.[773] Mgr. Maret, then, with his School, assert that the Council exercised its jurisdiction in reviewing the Papal sentence against Photius, and, moreover, that the Papal sentence was easily admitted by the Council, not on account of its irreformability, but because the case with which it dealt was clear, and because it had the consent of the other Patriarchs.[774] Neither of these assertions can be supported, and both are inconsistent with the Acts of the Council. For in the very first Session the Oriental Vicars adopted a definition which had been signed by a Catholic Synod

[771] "Octava Synodus Nicolai et Hadriani judicium executa est adversus Photium" (*Def. Decl. Cleri Gall.*, pt. ii., l. xiii., cap. vi., t. ii., p. 228).

[772] *Ibid.*, l. xii., cap. xxxii., t. ii., p. 203, seq.

[773] *Sur la Déclaration de* 1682, pt. iii., ch. xix., p. 299, seq.

[774] *Du Concile Général*, l. ii., ch. x., n. iv., t. i., p. 321, seq.

held in Constantinople, declaring that Pope Nicholas had pronounced a definitive sentence of condemnation against Photius and Gregory of Syracuse.[775] On this account the Eastern Bishops had anathematised all who should reject anything of what had been judged by Pope Nicholas.[776] Again, in the explanation of the definition given by them in the Council, they maintained that they had always regarded Photius as an usurper, for he had never been accepted by the Patriarchs of the East nor by the Roman Patriarch.[777] Nevertheless, although his guilt was manifest, they regarded it as definitively settled only when the Roman Pontiff pronounced a judgment against him. The Council unanimously declared that they agreed perfectly with the definition of the Oriental Vicars.[778] In the same manner the Synod, as we have said, by accepting the Letters of Popes Nicholas and Hadrian, not only acknowledged the justice of the condemnation pronounced against Photius, but also that supremacy of jurisdiction over Bishops and Patriarchs which resides in the Roman Pontiffs, and which Photius had denied.

But we must examine more particularly the ground on which Gallicans assert that the Eighth Synod exercised a full jurisdiction over the judicial sentence passed by the Pope against Photius. In the Fourth Session the Imperial Patricians insisted on a new trial being granted to Photius and his partisans: but in asking for a new trial they did not intend to throw doubt on the validity of the sentence passed by Pope Nicholas and his successor. They grounded their request on a

[775] *Definitio*, etc., cap. iii. "Beati termini Papa Nicolaus in Photio . . . dedit definitivam damnationem" (In Act. i., Conc. viii. Labbe, t. x., p. 501).

[776] *Ibid.*, cap. vi. (l. c., p. 502).

[777] L. c., p. 504.

[778] L. c., p. 503.

consideration of mercy towards men who were in want of medicinal help in the path of righteousness and truth.[779] The Synod, by the mouth of the Metropolitan of Smyrna, agreed with the view taken in the matter by the Patricians. But the Papal Legates informed the Synod that it was not in their power to rescind the sentence of the Roman Pontiff, and that to do so was against the Canons of the Church. Nevertheless, they continued, if Photius and his partisans should plead ignorance of the Papal sentence given against them, which was not credible, they could be brought before the Synod, and there hear the judgment pronounced against them by the Pope. Thus they would be deprived of all pretext for persisting in their course. The Patricians and the Synod perfectly agreed with the answer and the proposal of the Roman Legates.[780] Nevertheless the latter, in order to leave no room for doubt, solemnly declared, over and over again—"Nos non propter contentionem advocamus eos, sed ut tantum beatissimi Papæ Nicolai epistolam audiant."[781] In the Fifth Session, when Photius was introduced into the Council, they renewed the same declaration, that all might understand that they were not about to institute a new trial in the case of Photius.[782] In the same Session, when the Letters of Pope Nicholas against Photius were read, the Roman Legates again insisted that they were not about to begin a new trial, for the case had been terminated long before by Pope Nicholas and confirmed by Pope Hadrian, neither would they act

[779] "Rogamus ergo ut hi qui languent sanentur, et corrigantur qui non habent certitudinem veritatis, et erigantur qui deorsum jacent" (Act. iv. Labbe, l. c., pp. 524, 525).

[780] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 525, seq.).

[781] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 526).

[782] Act. iv. (l. c., p. 546). The Greek Acts are perfectly in accordance in all this part with the Latin Acts of Anastasius.

against the definitions and the laws of the Fathers.[783] Afterwards they asked the Synod whether it would accept the Papal definitions, and the assembled Fathers with one voice answered that they agreed with them all.[784] Again in the Seventh Session, when Photius was a second time introduced before the Synod, the Papal Legates alone acted as judges, with full powers, while all the Council was silent; the Legates alone, after having convicted Photius by the perusal of the Papal Letters, renewed against the obstinate schismatic the sentence which Pope Nicholas and Pope Hadrian had already pronounced.[785] And when, in the Fifth Session, the Patrician Bahanes was pressing Photius to give signs of repentance, and make an act of submission to the Papal sentence, he added that "post discessum Sanctorum Vicariorum, cuncta inutilia et invalida erunt, quæ a te dicta et acta constiterint."[786] As if he would warn him that all was in the hands of the Legates as the representatives of the Pope.

Now whoever attentively reads the Acts, of which we can here give only a sketch, must be surprised to remark that the assertions of the Gallican School are nothing else than the maxims of the Photians in the Eighth Council. It is untrue that the Synod attributed to itself the jurisdiction of examining and of judging the sentence of Nicholas and Hadrian, still more that it actually did so. No new trial, in fact, took place in the Eighth Session in the case of Photius and his partisans,

[783] "Non ergo novum aliquod vel recens judicium judicabimus, aut introducemus, sed vetus ex multo tempore judicatum quidem a sanctissimo et beatissimo Papa Nicolao, firmatum autem a sanctissimo Papa Hadriano; et non possumus transferri vel commoveri a paternis definitionibus et legibus" (Act. v., Conc. viii. Labbe, l. c., p. 550).

[784] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 550, seq.).

[785] Act. vii., Conc. viii. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 571, 603).

[786] Act. v., Conc. viii. (l. c., p. 551).

and the intimation of the Papal sentence to the schismatic party devolved on the Papal Legates alone. Again, the Papal Legates defend the irreformability of the sentence inflicted on Photius simply on the ground that it is a Papal sentence, not because it had been approved by the other Patriarchs. They allege the definitions and the laws of the Fathers only in support of their assertion that a Papal sentence is not open to any change or reformation. Finally, the Synod, in the second of its Decrees of faith, enacted in the Tenth Session, bore witness to the justice of the position we have taken. For in that Decree it ordered that all should keep and observe the synodical definitions of Nicholas and Hadrian against Photius, precisely because the Pope is an organ of the Holy Ghost.[787] The Synod does not define that the Decrees of Nicholas and Hadrian are to be observed because they had been sanctioned by the Oriental Patriarchs, or because the guilt of Photius was evident; but because Nicholas and Hadrian are regarded by the Synod as organs of the Holy Ghost, that is to say, on account of their divine uncontrollable authority. For this reason the Eighth Synod, like the preceding, followed faithfully the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, and submitted to him, as members to their Head.

[787] "Beatissimum Papam Nicolaum tanquam organum Sancti Spiritus habentes, necnon et sanctissimum Hadrianum Papam successorem ejus, definimus et sancimus etiam omnia quæ ab eis synodice per diversa tempore exposita sunt . . . servari semper et custodiri cum expositis capitulis immutilata pariter et illæsa," etc. (Cap. ii. in Act. x., Conc. viii. Labbe, l. c., p. 633).

SECTION XIII.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY FROM THE EIGHTH TO THE SIXTEENTH COUNCIL. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

FROM the year 869, when the Eighth Ecumenical Synod was held in Constantinople, no other General Council was assembled in the Church till 1123, when Pope Callistus II. convened the Ninth General Council in the Lateran to ratify the Concordat of Worms, which put an end to the great contest concerning investitures between the Church and the Empire.[788] The Second General Council of Lateran was called by Innocent II. in 1139, principally for the purpose of checking the fatal schism of Pier Leone, and putting a restraint on the audacity of Pier of Bruis and Arnold of Brescia, whose poisonous doctrine was spreading in the provinces of Italy and in Rome itself a spirit hostile to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff.[789] A third General Synod was also held in the Lateran forty years later by Alexander III., with the view of redressing the disorders produced by the schisms of the anti-Popes, and to eradicate the many evils which had become prevalent among Christians.[790] We can say that the first three Lateran Synods did not properly regard the condemnation of new errors, but matters of discipline. Nevertheless, from the Eighth to the Eleventh Ecumenical Council (869—1179), new

[788] Conc. Lat. i. (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1327, seq.).
[789] Conc. Lat. ii. (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1498, seq.).
[790] Conc. Lat. iii. (Labbe, t. xiii., p. 410, seq.).

heresies and new errors appeared in the Church, but they were definitively condemned by the infallible authority of the Roman Pontiff, without any need being felt that the Bishops of the world should assemble. It is beyond any doubt that the doctrine of Berengarius on the Eucharist was heretical. He professed to draw it from the writings of John Scotus Erigena; he denied every kind of substantial change in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and seemed only to admit the simple virtue of Christ's Humanity in the bread and wine consecrated with the words of institution. His errors were widely spread in France, and received the patronage of a strong party. Leo IX. was the first to condemn them, in a Synod held at Rome in 1050, and again in another assembled the same year in Vercelli.[791] Five years after (1055) the condemnation was renewed by Victor II. in a Synod convened in Florence.[792] Nicholas II. compelled the heretic to burn his own writings and to renounce his errors, in the presence of a Synod held in Rome in 1059.[793] But Berengarius subsequently withdrew his retractation and returned to his vomit. In vain did Alexander II. kindly exhort him to reject his error; he remained stubborn and scornful in his perversity and hypocrisy. Finally, it was in the Synods held in Rome by Gregory VII. in 1078 and 1079, that he submitted to the condition imposed on him for a complete reconciliation with the Church. But the formula which the great Pontiff required Berengarius to sign clearly reveals the consciousness he had of his own infallibility when he framed it. The heresiarch was obliged to believe *corde*

[791] Conc. Rom. ii. sub Leone IX. Papa; Conc. Vercellense (Labbe, t. xi., p. 1427, seq., p. 1431, seq.).

[792] Conc. Florentinum (Labbe, t. xii., p. 3).

[793] Conc. Rom. sub Nicolao II. Berengarii abjuratio (Labbe, t. xii., p. 46).

and *ore* the doctrine of the real substantial presence of Christ our Lord in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and to take an oath on the Gospel to attest the sincerity of his profession.[794] A profession of faith which commands our reason to submit without reserve, is an infallible utterance of the official organ of the Holy Ghost in the Church. Gregory VII., like his predecessors, was really an organ of the Holy Ghost, and, therefore, his Decree against the heresy of Berengarius, without any Ecumenical Council, was sufficient to counteract the artifices of the heretic, and to put an end to the controversy. Gregory VII. had a strong persuasion of his own infallibility as a Successor of St. Peter in the Roman See, and he was aware that the belief in that Papal prerogative was deeply established in the Universal Church. In the *Apologeticus* for his Decrees, he openly intimates that the decisions of the most holy Pontiffs should be venerated with greater devotion than those of the first four General Councils, because the latter require the authority of the Roman Pontiffs, while the former stand in no need of any confirmation whatsoever.[795] On this account he solemnly declared, in a Synod held at Rome, that "Romana Ecclesia nunquam erravit, nec in perpetuum Scripturâ testante errabit."[796] And again —"Quod Catholicus non habetur qui non concordat Romanæ Ecclesiæ;"[797] and at the same time he declared that "Sententia Papæ a nullo debeat retractari et ipse

[794] "Ego Berengarius corde credo et ore confiteor," etc. (See it in Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbol. et Definit.*, p. 133. Wirceburgi, 1867).

[795] "Decreta SS. RR. PP., si possemus, etiam studiosius quam illa quatuor, concilia venerari et observare deberemus," etc. (*Apologeticus super Decreta*, n. iii. Edit. Migne, Op., t. i., p. 754. Labbe, t. xii., p. 552).

[796] *Dictatus Papæ Gregorii VII.*, n. 22 (Labbe, t. xii., p. 341).

[797] *Ibid.*, n. 26.

omnium solus retractare possit."[798] Nevertheless, his principles even in that age were fully acknowledged, and unanimously professed in the Church. Ivo Carnotensis, a Bishop highly esteemed in France both in his age and afterwards, pointedly said in his letter to Richer, Archbishop of Sens, that resistance to the judgments and the Decrees of the Apostolic See is a sure mark of heretical pravity.[799] And he appeals to the traditional teaching of the Church, especially to that of Pope Gelasius and of St. Gregory I.[800] Likewise, the Council of Quedlinburgh (1085) expressly maintained the same maxim, as having been laid down by the Fathers of the Church; the assembled Bishops examined the doctrines of the holy Fathers (say the synodical Acts) on the Primacy of the Apostolical See, to the effect that no one has power to re-examine its judgment or to pronounce any sentence on it. And all the Synod, with unanimous and public consent, praised and confirmed this teaching.[801] From this we must conclude that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, proclaimed and put in practice by Gregory VII., does not date merely from the year 1080, as "Janus" has had the boldness to assert, nor was it built on forgeries of the Hildebrandine era, still less was it called up as a means to support the system of the Papal universal domination.[802] These

[798] *Dictatus Papæ Gregorii VII.*, n. 18 (l. c.).

[799] See Ivo Carnot., *Epist.* viii. (Op., t. ii., p. 18. Edit. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. clxii.). "Cujus (Apostolicæ Sedis) judiciis et constitutionibus obviare, plane est hæreticæ pravitatis notam incurrere."

[800] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 19).

[801] "Cum ergo omnes juxta ordinem suum consedissent, prolata sunt in medium decreta sanctorum Patrum de primatu Sedis Apostolicæ: quod nulli unquam liceat ejus judicium retractare, et de ejus judicio judicare. Quod de totius Synodi publica professione laudatum et confirmatum est" (Synod. Quintilineburgensis. Labbe, t. xii., p. 680).

[802] *The Pope and the Council*, sec. vii., p. 100, seq. By "Janus." London, 1869.

assertions and the like are nothing short of impudent calumnies in "Janus," grounded on ignorance of history and the most shameless perversion of facts. We saw in the second section of this book that the principles of Gregory VII. on Papal authority and infallibility were the principles of antiquity, proclaimed and constantly acted upon by the earliest Successors of St. Peter. The Popes, when elected, solemnly promised, in their profession of faith, to receive and maintain all the synodical Decrees of their predecessors, and to anathematise all whom they had anathematised.[803] The formula of faith composed by Pope Hormisdas, and adopted by the Oriental Church after the Acacian schism and after the Photian rebellion, implies no less than what Gregory VII. maintained. And finally, in the profession of faith made by the Roman Pontiff ever since the Eighth Synod, the Papal Decrees are put on the same level with the Ecumenical Constitutions, and, moreover, they are spoken of as necessary to be observed.[804] Therefore, the irreformability of the Decrees of Popes, and consequently the infallibility of their doctrinal decisions, are not doctrines introduced into the Church by the ambitious pretensions of some Pontiffs, much less by forgery and deceit; they are as old as the Church itself, and intimately connected with its fundamental principles and its divine Constitution.

Again, Innocent II. condemned the heresies of Abelard by a definitive sentence, without any need whatever of a General Council. The provincial Synod of Soissons (1120) had already pronounced a judgment against the errors of this heretic.[805] Later, in 1140, St.

[803] *Liber Diurnus RR. LL.*, cap. ii., p. 58, tertia prof. fidei (Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. cv.).

[804] *Professio fidei R. Pontificis. Ex diurno Ant. Augustini* (Labbe, t. x., p. 997).

[805] Concilium Suessoniense (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1315, seq.).

Bernard deemed that he should be condemned anew in another Synod held at Sens; the erroneous doctrine having meantime spread widely.[806] But Abelard appealed from the sentence of the Synod to Pope Innocent II., and the Synod itself referred its sentence to the Pontiff, and expected from him a definitive decision."[807] The Synod addressed the Pope as follows —"We advanced in this business, most blessed Father, as far as we could. For the rest, it belongs to you to preserve from any defilement of heretical pravity the immaculate candour of the Church. The Spouse of Christ is intrusted to you, O friend of the Divine Spouse.[808] St. Bernard also at the same time forwarded to the Pope a letter, which clearly exhibits the prerogative of the Apostolic See, and especially that of infallibility. "It is necessary," he says, "to refer to your Apostleship whatsoever danger and scandal may arise in the Kingdom of God, especially those which concern the faith. For I think it to be proper that the injuries of the faith should be repaired there where the faith cannot fail. This certainly is the prerogative of this See. Because to what other See was it ever said by Christ—'I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not?' Therefore, what follows is required of Peter's Successors—'And thou, when thou are converted, confirm thy brethren.'"[809] And the Saint concludes his letter by saying—"Being unable to do anything to repair the injuries of the faith, I judge it to be fitting to send word of the state of affairs to him whose weapons are mighty to God unto the pulling down every maxim contrary to the faith, unto destroying

[806] Concilium Senonense (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1527).

[807] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 1530).

[808] *Ibid.* (l. c.).

[809] S. Bernardi, *Epist.* cxc., seu *Tractatus ad Innocentium II.*, Præf. (Op., t. i., p. 1053. Edit. Migne).

every height that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, and unto bringing into captivity every understanding to the obedience of Christ."[810] Now the words of the Synod, as well as those of St. Bernard, who was its soul, show what was the persuasion of their age, that the Roman Pontiff is the judge without appeal in the controversies of faith. No comment on these passages need be added.

But what answer did Innocent II. give to the Synod of Sens and to St. Bernard, who had in strong terms entreated him to pronounce a sentence of condemnation against Abelard? We must give his own words, in order to exhibit them in their whole strength. "Nos itaque," he says, "qui in cathedra Sancti Petri, cui a Domino dictum est, Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos, licet indigni residere conspicimur, communicato fratrum nostrorum Episcoporum Cardinalium consilio, destinata nobis a vestra discretione capitula et universa ipsius Petri dogmata, sanctorum canonum auctoritate, cum suo auctore damnamus eique tanquam hæretico perpetuum silentium imposuimus. Universos quoque erroris sui sectatores et defensores a fidelium consortio sequestrandos et excommunicationis vinculo innodandos esse censemus."[811] If our adversary wish to have an instance of a definition *ex cathedrâ*, this is a perfect one. The Pontiff speaks from the Chair of St. Peter as the organ divinely appointed to apply, to explain, and to define the doctrine of the Apostle. At the same time he refers to Christ's promises as the source of the prerogative of judging definitively any controversy of faith, and of preserving immaculate the deposit of the revealed doctrine. Finally, he unreservedly condemns the error of Abelard, declares him

[810] L. c., cap. ix., n. 26 (l. c., p. 1072).

[811] *Epist. Innocentii II. Papæ ad Conc. Senon.* (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1532).

to be a heretic, and pronounces a sentence of anathema against any one who should follow his doctrines or give them any countenance. In another Letter to the Council he gives orders that Abelard, and Arnold his disciple, should be confined in some Religious House, and their writings burned wherever they should be met with.[812] Thus an end was put to the controversy, which was never treated by any General or Ecumenical Council.

Another instance to the same effect is afforded by the condemnation of Gilbert de la Porrée, Bishop of Poitiers. He was accused of heretical propositions, principally concerning the mystery of the Holy Trinity. But he appealed to Pope Eugenius III., to whom also the French Prelates referred his cause, although they were fully persuaded that their symbol of faith alone expressed the Catholic doctrine, which they wished constantly to defend. Pope Eugenius, therefore, informed them that their religious profession was in perfect accordance with the doctrines of the Roman Church.[813] As to Gilbert, his cause was examined in the Synod of Paris, and afterwards in that of Reims, before the Pope himself (1148). Eugenius III. definitively condemned the heretical propositions concerning the Holy Trinity contained in a book of the accused Bishop. But since he humbly submitted to the Papal sentence, and recanted his errors, he was preserved in his see and in his dignity.[814] Again on that occasion a solemn recog-

[812] *Epist.* ii. *Innocentii II. ad Conc. Sen.* (Labbe, l. c.).

[813] *Epistola Gaufridi ad Episcopum Albanensem* (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1670). "Quibus sine cunctatione Dominus Papa respondit ut universis qui miserant eos renuntiare præcepit: quod ab eadem confessione eorum in nullo prorsus Romana Ecclesia dissentiret."

[814] *Acta Concilii Remensis*, ex Othone Frisingensi (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1662, seq.). "Episcopus præmissam Summi Pontificis sententiam reverenter excipiens . . . cum ordinis integritate et honoris plenitudine ad propriam diœcesim remeavit." Gaufridus, in *Vita S. Bernardi*, l. iii., cap. v. (Op. S. Bernardi, t. iv., p. 312. Edit.

nition was given to the Roman Pontiff as possessing the supreme prerogative of declaring the matter to be of faith, and of prescribing the formulæ of faith. For when the French Bishops, wishing to oppose the errors of Gilbert with a particular symbol of faith, met together with St. Bernard for that purpose, the Cardinals in a body earnestly complained to the Pope of the assumption of this task by the French Prelates. "It is only the Roman See," they said to the Pope, "which opens and no one shuts, shuts and no one opens; it is only the Roman See which has the right to judge the causes of faith, and no one can usurp the singular honour of that prerogative."[815] The French Prelates not only abstained from contradicting the doctrine laid down by the body of the Cardinals, but they declared to Pope Eugenius, through St. Bernard, that they did not intend to define any article of faith in drawing up a formula of faith, but thought only of setting forth what they believed in the simplicity of their hearts.[816] This is another proof of our point.[817] The Pope, with or without an Ecu-

Migne). "Ita demum Apostolico judicio et auctoritate universalis Ecclesiæ error ille damnatur. Episcopus Gillebertus an eidem damnationi consentiat, interrogatur. Consentiens et publice refutans quæ prius scripserat et affirmaverat, indulgentiam ipse consequitur," etc. Gaufridus, Epist. cit. (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1670). "Dominus Papa auctoritate Apostolica, de assensu totius Ecclesiæ quæ convenerat, capitula ipsa damnavit. . . . Cumque responderet Episcopus: Ego corrigam ad arbitrium vestrum. Non vobis, ait, hæc correctio committetur."

[815] *Acta Conc. Remensis*, ex Othone Frisingensi (Labbe, t. xii., p. 1664).

[816] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 1664, seq.).

[817] Mr. Renouf in his last pamphlet, *The Case of Pope Honorius Reconsidered* (p. 96, seq.), when making mention of the case of Gilbert de la Porrée, with the view of correcting what we had said on the subject in our *Pope Honorius* (sec. iii., p. 44), has given a half page containing almost as many blunders as assertions. He says that "Petavius admits that he found an original MS. of the

menical Council, judges in a definitive manner upon controversies of faith; and not only no one protests against the exercise of this prerogative, but all proclaim it, and acknowledge in him the great gift of Infallibility.

This doctrine, which in the twelfth century was so widely propagated in the Western Church, was not unknown to the East. In fact, in the disputations which Anselm, Bishop of Havelburgh, had with the Greeks in the hope of convincing them of their error, we read that although Anselm endeavoured to narrow, as far as possible, the doctrines necessary to their reconciliation, he did not think it right to set aside the dogma of Papal Infallibility, as being implied in the doctrine of

very book of Gilbert referred to by Gaufridus, 'in quo quæ Gaufridus refert (the *errors*) minime continentur.'" Whoever reads Petavius and the letter of Gaufridus referred to, will find that neither the French theologian nor Gaufridus spoke of the *errors* of which Gilbert had been accused to the Pope, and which were examined in the Councils of Paris and Reims. Gaufridus, after having stated the errors which were brought before the Council, adds—"Erant et alia quæ in scholis suis dicebatur auditoribus suis idem Episcopus tradidisse" (l. c., p. 1670). Petavius speaks only of those in the quoted passage; and of those only says that they were not found in the MS. of his work. But Mr. Renouf supposed that the *errors* were those in question. Moreover, he asserts that "Gilbert came out of the inquiry triumphantly, and lived and died with all the honours of his episcopal rank." How could Mr. Renouf be so ignorant of the condemnation of Gilbert's errors, of his submission, of his retractation, and of the pardon received on account of his docility, as to venture so bold an assertion? The true triumph of Gilbert was his Christian submission and his humble retractation. Thirdly, he continues—"The Roman Cardinals sided with him on this occasion; they were indignant with the French Bishops, and loudly complained to the Pope." Whoever has read our text will be surprised at this great blunder of Mr. Renouf in an historical narrative, of which he could not be ignorant had he simply read the chapter of Otho Frisingensis which he quotes at the foot of page.

the divine supremacy intrusted to the Successor of St. Peter. He loudly proclaimed that "the Roman Church alone, because of its being founded upon the Rock and consolidated by it, had always been unshaken, and by no sophistical argument of heretics had ever been carried away from the purity of that faith which Simon Barjona had professed; because it had always been shielded by the wisdom of God, through the grace of our Lord. . . . And therefore the Lord knowing that . . the Roman Church which He had founded upon the Rock would never be weakened in the faith, said to Peter: 'I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not; and thou, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.' As if He had openly said: 'Thou who hast received this grace, that while those are shipwrecked in faith, thou remainest always in faith immoveable and constant, confirm and correct them that waver; and as the Provider, and Doctor, and Father, and Master, have care and solicitude for all.'"[818] Nothing can speak more plainly in favour of Papal Infallibility; especially considering that this language was uttered a century before St. Thomas; that it was addressed to Greek schismatics, and represented the mind of the Catholic Church of that time.[819]

But we should never make an end were we to gather all the testimonies in favour of Papal Infallibility which the twelfth and thirteenth centuries afford. We will content ourselves with a glance at those General Councils which preceded the Assembly of Constance. In the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), Pope Innocent III. displayed all the majesty of a Pope in the

[818] Ἀντικείμενον, l. iii., cap. v. (In D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, t. i., p. 194. Paris, 1723).

[819] See other passages of this work referred to in the admirable Pastoral of Archbishop Manning on the Ecumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Pope, p. 60.

full exercise of his infallible *magisterium.* It is he who decrees, who legislates, who condemns, and who defines the dogma to be believed by the Church: the Synod adheres to his decision, but it adheres as a judge with full knowledge of the cause. Therefore the formula, *Sacro approbante Concilio,* was employed in that Council, and was retained in the ecclesiastical jurisprudence of the age, in order to show clearly what is the true nature of an Ecumenical Council.[820] The Council approves the decisions of the Pope, and it cannot fail to do so, because it represents the body of the Church united with its Supreme Head; and to resist his supreme authority would be to detach itself from it; which is against the divine promises concerning the indefectibility of God's Church. Nevertheless, as we have said, the Synod must inquire into the doctrines proposed for definition, because divine tradition was left with the Church, and is to be manifested by the voice of the Bishops, who bear an imperishable witness to it. In the meantime, no one of the Bishops in the Apostolic succession could attribute to himself the character of the Master and Doctor of the Universal Church, because no one has power over the whole flock of Christ, nor is infallible in his utterances. That prerogative belongs only to the Roman Apostolic See. Therefore in the Fourth Lateran Council, it was repeatedly ascribed to this.[821] Nay, Pope Innocent pointedly showed that this was the universal persuasion not only of the Catholics, but even of those who had deviated from the path of truth, and were on the verge of heresy. He informed the Council and the Universal Church, that Joachim

[820] Conc. Lat. iv., cap. ii. (Labbe, t. xiii., p. 931); cap. viii. (l. c., p. 942).

[821] The Roman Church is called "Disponente Domino Mater universorum Christi fidelium et magistra" (Conc. Lat. iv., cap. ii. Labbe, t. xiii., p. 934; cap. iv., l. c., p. 938).

(whose errors he condemned in the Synod) "omnia scripta sua nobis assignari mandavit, Apostolicæ Sedis judicio approbanda, seu etiam corrigenda dictans epistolam, cui propriâ manu subscripsit, in qua firmiter confitetur se illam fidem tenere quam Romana tenet Ecclesia, quæ cunctorum fidelium, disponente Domino, Mater est et Magistra."[822] Joachim, then, professed what the Universal Church acknowledged in the formula put forth by Hormisdas, and used by other Popes: that the test of orthodoxy was to hold the faith of the Roman Chair, because in that See resides the authentic *magisterium* of the Church. This is a profession of Papal Infallibility.

We pass over the First Council of Lyons (1245) held by Pope Innocent IV.; the principal object of which was the solemn and definitive deposition of the Emperor Frederick II. But the Second of Lyons (1274) calls for special attention, since the supreme and infallible authority of the Pope appears in it in a very remarkable manner. This Second Council of Lyons was assembled by Pope Gregory X. for the purpose of setting on foot a new Crusade, and of effecting a union of the Greek with the Latin Church. Urban IV. and Clement IV., predecessors of Gregory X., had sent their aprocrisiaries to Michael Paleologus, Emperor of Constantinople, to persuade him to come to terms of union with the Roman See. They promised him the convocation of an Ecumenical Council for the reunion of the Greek Church, but not before the Emperor and the Greek Clergy should have signed a profession of faith sent to them by the Pope, and recognised the supremacy and full authority of the Holy See. Clement IV. therefore forwarded to the Emperor a profession of faith, which was intended to restore the Greek schismatic Church to the unity of faith, even before the assembly of

[822] Conc. Lat. iv., cap. i. (l. c.).

a General Synod. But Pope Clement did not survive to see the result of his message to the Greek Emperor. Gregory X., his successor, having convened the Second Ecumenical Council of Lyons, dispatched his Legates to Constantinople with a Letter for the Emperor Michael, entreating him to sign the profession of faith drawn up by Clement, and to take part in the General Council, in order to effect the long-desired union. The Greek Emperor willingly accepted the Papal proposal. He submitted to the conditions, signing the profession of faith, which was read in the Second Synod of Lyons,[823] and sending his representatives to take part in the Council.

Now let us consider for a moment the purport and the character of the profession of faith which was sent by Clement IV. and by Gregory X. to the Emperor Michael. It is beyond doubt that the document in question was framed by the Popes without any Ecumenical Council, and that it moreover professed to convey exactly the doctrines of the Roman Church.[824] Again, it is evident that Gregory, like his predecessor, demanded of the Emperor that the profession of faith should be accepted and signed, as a necessary preliminary to the admission of the Eastern Clergy into the Council;[825] nor was he allowed to sign it with any sort of reserve, nor even under the condition that it should be sanctioned by the General Council after a synodical examination and revision. Pope Gregory pointedly excluded this condition, on the ground that the

[823] *Litteræ Michaelis Palæologi Imp. ad Gregorium Papam X.* (Labbe, t. xiv., p. 507, seq.).

[824] *Epist. Gregorii Papæ X. ad Michaelem Imp.* (Labbe, t. xiv., p. 486). "In iisdem litteris veræ fidei Catholicæ professionem quam eadem Romana Ecclesia firmiter tenet, fideliter docet, constanter prædicat, et publice profitetur."

[825] *Ibid.* (l. c., p. 486, seq.).

doctrines contained in the profession of faith rest on the Word of God and on the traditional teaching of the Fathers, and that they had been defined by the Roman Pontiffs.[826] Nor is this all. In the profession which Clement IV. and Gregory X. forwarded to the Emperor, several articles of faith are contained which no Ecumenical Council had ever expressly defined. Such are, the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, the doctrines concerning the Sacraments and as to the state of the soul after death.[827] Now, the Pope imposed on a whole Church and on four Patriarchates a profession of faith, containing articles not yet defined by any Ecumenical Council, on the eve of the assembly of the Bishops of the world, and he ordered that it should be signed and believed without any reserve, and that it should not be on any account submitted to an Ecumenical Council. This cannot be understood if the Pope be not infallible in his dogmatical *magisterium*, and if the persuasion of his infallibility had not been common in that age in the whole Church. This is the more confirmed, because the formula of faith was read in full Session in the Second Council of Lyons; the Assembly was informed of the covenant concluded between the Pope and the Greek Emperor, of the conditions imposed on the latter, of the signatures appended to the Papal profession of faith, before the meeting of the Synod, and without any reference whatever to its authority. Nevertheless, no one of the assembled Fathers complained of the conduct of

[826] "Non ad prædictæ (Professionis fidei) discussionem, vel novam definitionem fidei, quam tanquam innumeris sacræ paginæ auctoritatibus, numerosis sanctorum Patrum sententiis et Romanorum Pontificum stabili definitione firmatam, nec ipse voluit, nec nos intendimus, sicut nec decet, nec foret expediens, in dubium, novo ipsam exponendo examini, revocare" (Epist. Greg. Papæ cit. l. c., p. 487).

[827] Litteræ Michaelis Imp. cit. (l. c., p. 509).

the Roman Pontiff, no one made any exception, no one uttered the least remark on the subject. What doubt, then, can be felt that the Fathers of Lyons were convinced of the great dogma of Papal Infallibility?

But, moreover, the doctrine of the full, uncontrolled, and irreformable authority of the Pope in matters of faith and discipline was plainly stated in this profession. It acknowledged in the Roman Pontiff a divine supremacy "cum potestatis plenitudine," so that all the Churches are subject to his supreme judgment, and if controversies arise concerning the faith, they are to be settled by his decision.[828] Now, if causes of faith are necessarily to be settled by the judgment of the Pope, his judgment must be infallible and irreformable; for, should a definition be pronounced by a General Council on a doctrinal controversy, it is null and void of effect until it rests on the rock of the final definition of the Roman Pontiff. The decisions of the Synod of Rimini, of the Ephesine Latrocinium, etc., though sanctioned by the imperial authority, fell to the ground, because they were rejected by the Papal *magisterium*. Thus, again, we find that the superiority of the Council over the Pope, and the reformability of the dogmatical definitions of the latter, are only dreams of the older and the more modern Gallican Schools. Nevertheless, as we said in the seventh section, the case of a formal disagreement in a matter of faith between the whole body of the Catholic Episcopate and the Pope never will occur, as we are assured by the promises made by Christ to His Church.

But to return to the thread of our subject. The Council of Lyons listened without any mark of dissent to all the articles of the profession regarding the authority of the Roman Pontiff, nor could they attribute to them a different meaning when they had before their

[828] "Si quæ de fide subortæ fuerint quæstiones, suo debent judicio definiri," etc. (Litteræ Michaelis Imp. cit., l. c., p. 512).

eyes the fact of the several doctrines, which had never been synodically defined, pointed out in the profession as articles of faith on the strength of the Papal definition alone. Thus, again, the Council, by accepting the profession of faith of the Eastern Church[829] without any shade of opposition, confirms us in the persuasion that it acknowledged the full and infallible authority of the Roman Pontiff.

Finally, the very manner in which the Decrees of the Synod were published, and especially the first Constitution regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost, conveys again and again the idea of the Papal Infallibility. The Constitutions are said to be "a Gregorio Papa decimo sancitæ in Concilio Lugdunensi."[830] Moreover, in the first dogmatical Decree on the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, the Pope declares that "hoc (dogma) professa est hactenus, prædicavit et docuit, hoc firmiter tenet, prædicat, profitetur et docet Sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia, Mater omnium fidelium et Magistra."[831] That is to say, the Pontiff gives the reasons for which he defines the dogma, and the first is that it had always been held and professed by the Roman Church, which is the supreme Teacher and Mother of all the Faithful. Next comes the unanimous tradition of the Latin and Greek Church; then the Pope, of his own authority, condemns the contrary doctrine, "sacro approbante Concilio." The Synod merely approves what the Pope does in the exercise of his supreme infallible authority. We may call attention, in passing, to the very superficial treatment of the Council of Lyons by Mgr. Maret;

[829] The oaths of the Emperor and of the Greek Clergy are to be found in the Acts of the Second Council of Lyons (Labbe, t. xiv., pp. 513, 516).

[830] Labbe, t. xiv., p. 520.

[831] *Ibid.*, l. c.

he failed to find in it anything which could be made to serve the purpose of supporting the proposition which he had undertaken to prove.[832]

Let us now give a glance at the Council of Vienne, which is the Fifteenth Ecumenical Synod. It was convoked by Clement V. in 1311, at the request of Philip the Fair, King of France, and for the cause of the Knights Templars. The Bull of Convocation, which Bossuet abstains from mentioning,[833] and the principal part of which Mgr. Maret suppresses,[834] bears clear testimony to the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, which was in that age universally acknowledged in the Church. The Pope, after having, like his predecessors, Innocent III. and Gregory X., asserted that the Roman Church is, by disposition of God, Mother of all the Faithful, Head of all other Churches, and Universal Teacher, goes on to say that "from it, as from a primitive source, the streams of the same faith flow into all the other Churches, for whose government the mercy of Christ has appointed the Roman Pontiff to be His Minister and to hold His place on earth; that all those who have been regenerated by the baptismal font may, from the words of the Pontiff, receive and preserve the doctrine of the evangelical truth, so that those who continue to the end of their life under the guidance of that doctrine may be saved, and those who deviate from it be condemned."[835] Thus, according to Clement V., (1.) the original fountain of the Catholic doctrine is the Apostolic See; (2.) the person from whose lips all the Faithful must receive that

[832] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. ii., n. iii., seq., t. i., p. 362, seq.

[833] *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gall.*, pt. ii., l. xii., cap. xxxviii., t. ii., p. 211, seq.

[834] *Du Concile Général*, t. iii., ch. iii., n. i., t. i., p. 371.

[835] *Epist. Clementis V. pro Concilio Viennensi* (Labbe, t. xv., p. 19).

doctrine is the Roman Pontiff; (3.) those who adhere to his teaching, and whose lives are in accord with it, shall be saved, all others condemned. In these three propositions of Clement V. is contained the full doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

The condemnation of the Templars pronounced by the Council of Vienne does not concern our argument, and we willingly pass over it. We will say only a word on the dogmatical Decrees which were published in the Synod. They were certainly promulgated by the Pope himself, as possessing the plenitude of authority in the Church. Observe the expressions used by him in the beginning of his Constitution—*De Summa Trinitate et de Fide Catholica.* "We then, bearing in mind so illustrious testimony of the Scripture, and the common opinion of the holy Fathers and Doctors, and directing to them our Apostolical authority, to which alone (*duntaxat*) it belongs to declare these things, declare, *Sacro approbante Concilio*, etc."[836] The Pontiff, in the presence of the Ecumenical Council, openly asserted that it belongs only to the Apostolical See to declare the doctrines of faith, and the Council raised no objection to any part of his Constitution, but they approved it in its whole and in all its parts. They therefore acknowledged the superiority and the irreformability of the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs. Bossuet, in order to weaken the force of this passage, gives to the word *duntaxat* the meaning of "without."[837] Otherwise, he says, it would entirely exclude the authority of the Council, with whose approbation the

[836] *Constitutiones Clementis V.*, l. i., tit. i., cap. i. (In *Corpore Juris*, t. ii., p. 351. Parisiis, 1695). "Ad quam (Apostolicam considerationem) duntaxat hæc declarare pertinet."

[837] "Hanc igitur auctoritatem nobis objicient, cum clarum sit illud, duntaxat, intelligi, hæc sine sede Apostolica tractari non posse" (l. c., p. 212).

Decrees are defined. Mgr. Maret says more or less the same, but he concludes—"Disons donc que la pénétration de l'examen apostolique, qui seule doit décider les questions de foi, n'exclut pas le concours de l'Épiscopat."[838] Mgr. Maret may be assured that no theologian, while defending the Infallibility of the Pope, excludes the concurrence of the Episcopal body, according to what we have said in the seventh section of this book. But it is one thing that Papal definitions do not exclude the concurrence of the Episcopal body, and another thing that the Pope, when defining, requires this as a necessary condition for the exercise of his infallible authority. Again, the Episcopal body can do nothing but concur, giving its consent to the doctrinal Acts of the Papal *magisterium;* but the Papal *magisterium* is in no need of the Episcopate before its utterances, that they may be infallible. The Pope calls upon the body of the Bishops in Ecumenical Councils for the reasons explained in the seventh section; but he has always the right to define infallibly the doctrine in question, even before any Episcopal assembly has been held, which in such cases is called only to show the more unmistakably the unity and infallibility of the whole body of the Church in its dogmatic teaching.

Before turning our attention to another subject, we must make a remark on what Mgr. Maret asserts regarding the Council of Vienne. "Le Concile de Vienne," he says, "donna son consentement à la révocation de la fameuse Bulle *Clericis laicos,* publiée par Boniface VIII. en 1296; et, dans cette circonstance encore, il fit acte de participation à la souveraineté."[839] The reader will be surprised to hear that the Constitution *Meruit* was published by Clement V. in 1306,[840]

[838] *Du Concile Général,* l. iii., ch. iii., n. iv., t. i., p. 375.

[839] *Ibid.,* n. iii., p. 373.

[840] Raynaldus, *Annales Eccl.,* an. 1306, n. 1, t. xv., p. 8. Coloniæ.

that is to say, five years before the convocation of the Council of Vienne. The Bull is inserted in the *Corpus Juris* under that year,[841] and no one, that we know, has ever thought that it was framed in the Council of Vienne. Mgr. Maret seems to have forgotten an important point of the history of his own country, anxious as he was to prove that the Synod of Vienne "fit acte de participation à la souveraineté." But of this Synod enough.

Now not only Catholic, but Protestant writers also have remarked that in this age the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was more developed, and began to take its proper shape. Even Gieseler noticed this historical fact.[842] So that it is a matter of wonder to hear in our day that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is an offspring of the theology of the sixteenth century, or, much worse, that it is an invention of our own age. Nevertheless, as it has chanced with other Catholic doctrines, so it has been in the case of Papal Infallibility for many centuries; it was retained in the Church as a traditional doctrine, handed down by the authentic *magisterium* and the living voice of the Episcopate, but still it did not appear from the very beginning in the full development of its natural form, detached from other dogmas, with which it is intimately connected, and in which it was involved. The fundamental doctrine of the supreme authority of the Pope in the Church, contained and implied for several centuries that of Papal Infallibility. In the meantime, the constant use

[841] *Extravag. Comm.*, l. i., tit. vii., *De Privilegiis*, cap. ii. (In *Corpore Juris*, t. ii., p. 421). Mgr. Maret puts it in l. iv., tit. xvii., cap. i. of the *Clementines*. The fourth book of the *Clementines* has only one title and one chapter, nor does it contain anything on the subject.

[842] *Ecclesiastical History*, div. iii., ch. ii., sec. 61, t. iii., p. 164. Edinburgh, 1853.

and practice of the Church, as we have seen, revealed its particular features so far as to show that the supreme authority of the Pope was not simply a jurisdictional power over the whole Church; but that, moreover, this implies a prerogative, by which it is superior to any assembly of Bishops, and irreformable in all its decisions. Papal Infallibility in dogmatical Decrees was living for centuries in this practical principle, but it had not yet received distinct expression and scientific form. It required development; but development was to be the fruit of the progressive action of the life of the Church, and the long work of centuries.

In the age of Gregory VII., as we have seen, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility began to appear in a more definite form, though its substance was identical with that which had always been held and practised in the Church from the beginning. But those who dwell only on the surface of historical events, and do not go far into the investigation of their true bearing, were easily led to attribute to Pope Hildebrand the authorship of the doctrine; they denied its existence before or even immediately after the separation of the Greek from the Latin Church; they ascribed to the imposture of the False Decretals, and to other forgeries, as well as to the extensive power and ambition of the Popes, the success of that idea, which seemed to them to be involved in the boundless power and almost divine attributes attributed, as they say, to the Papacy. The notorious work of "Janus," with the endless swarm of pamphlets and articles of Gallicans, Protestants, and infidels, directed against Papal Infallibility, rest entirely on this wrong principle, and all betray a complete ignorance of ecclesiastical history and of the progressive development of the traditional doctrine on the subject. A rigorous historical exposition and critical examination of the facts was sufficient to overthrow that policy of im-

posture and calumny which, in our day, are so much extolled by the enemies of the Papacy and of the Church. We have considered the prerogative of Papal Infallibility as being divine in its origin, and as in its action always connected with the full exercise of Papal supremacy in matters of doctrine; we have watched its development, as it grew and assumed forms more explicit and theoretical, and as it was moulded into more precise and definite language. Imposture and forgery had no share in its progress; the False Decretals contributed nothing to its progress, much less to its success;[843] and the civil power of the Popes, whilst adding new majesty to the institution of the Papacy, did not give any support to the prerogative of Infallibility, nor even did it promote the propagation of this doctrine in the Church.

Nevertheless, among the external causes which led to the logical development of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, we must reckon the study and progress of theological science. From the eleventh century onward, the taste for a logical treatment of theology spread on every side with great rapidity. Although that method was to Abelard and many others an occasion of error, yet, when kept within due bounds, and followed out under the guidance of Scripture and Tradition, it proved a help to the progress of theological science, and was useful for giving development to revealed doctrines. St. Augustine had followed this method long before the age of the Scholastics, and on this account they regarded him as the great source of their philosophy as well as of their theology. St. Anselm, the first of the Schoolmen, and founder of the methodical mode of teaching, was always a great

[843] See what we wrote on the true effects of the Pseudo-Decretals in our pamphlet, *The Papacy and Schism*, nn. iii., iv., pp. 14—32.

admirer and a faithful follower of St. Augustine. The same is true of the Angel of the Schools, St. Thomas, and of his followers. Now the methodical teaching of the theology in the Schools much contributed in the thirteenth and fourteenth century to advance the scientific development of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, and to give it deeper root in the minds of the Faithful. It is undeniable that for two centuries speculative theology, intently studied by the most penetrating minds, not only found no flaw in that doctrine, but gave it full support, and demonstrated it as a logical, undeniable result of the revelation of God.

St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his letter to Pope Urban II., when submitting to the Apostolical authority his book, *De Fide Trinitatis*, points out the reason of his determination. He says that Divine Providence had intrusted the Pope with the office of preserving the Christian faith and life, and of ruling the Church. From this office of the Pontiff he logically deduces the consequence that it is to the Pope, rather than to any other, that report should be made of any error which may arise in the Church, that he by his authority may heal the evil; and that it is to the Pope that a writing should be presented in which these errors are refuted, in order that he, by his prudence, may examine the work. And he concludes, that upon these grounds he had resolved to send to His Holiness his book against Roscelin, that it might be corrected by him in what it had fallen away from truth, and that it might receive support from his authority in what it was in accord with the rule of the faith.[844] This language of the founder of Scholastic Theology makes manifest his persuasion of the Infallibility of the Pope, but at the same time it shows how the saintly Schoolman derived

[844] *Epistola ad Urbanum Papam* (Op., t. i., p. 261. Migne, *PP. LL.*, t. clviii.).

the privilege of Papal Infallibility from the Ministry divinely committed to the Pope. In other words, St. Anselm's reasoning is as follows—That person has the power of condemning errors and confirming with his authority the doctrines of the faith, to whom the custody of the faith has been intrusted; but it has been intrusted to the Pope: therefore the Pope has the right of condemning errors and sanctioning dogmatic truths. By this he justifies his conduct in presenting to the Pope his refutation on the new errors against the Holy Trinity. From the very same principles he argues elsewhere that, to resist the Apostolical Decrees in support of the Christian faith is equivalent to resisting the decisions of Christ, and consequently to be excluded from the Kingdom, the keys of which were intrusted to Peter and his Successors.[845] The doctrine of Papal Infallibility is here again justified from the principles of Church Constitution. St. Bernard, while engaged in opposing such dialectic theology as goes astray from the path of the Scripture and of the Fathers, logically derived from Biblical and traditional principles the theory of Papal Infallibility; and this still more pointedly and openly than St. Anselm himself. But we have already quoted his words in the present section.

Although in the thirteenth century the scholastic theology became more decidedly fond of Aristotelic philosophy, and regarded Aristotle as a sure guide in all branches of science on which philosophy is grounded, yet the principal Schoolmen never forgot that the great Catholic truths must be derived from Scripture and tradition. From that fountain the Blessed Albert drew his teaching upon Papal Infallibility, as we see from the use he makes of the passage in the twenty-second chapter of St. Luke and from the sixteenth of

[845] *Epist.* lxv. (Op., t. ii., p. 103. Edit. cit.).

St. Matthew, in his commentaries on the Scriptures. "This argument" (from Luke xxii. 31), he says, "is very manifest in favour of the See of St. Peter and his Successor, that his faith shall never fail till the end of the world."[846] And on the words of St. Matthew (xvi. 19), he remarks that one alone received the keys of Heaven *in plenitudine potestatis*, and this one was Peter, with the Successors in his power; but the others have received these gifts only *in partem potestatis*.[847] By these last words Albert states the very doctrine which is at present called Ultramontane; in the preceding passage he had expressed the character of the authority in matters of faith possessed by the Roman Pontiff: that is to say, it was such as not to be liable to any mistake or error whatever.

But far better did the greatest pupil of Albert, St. Thomas Aquinas, explain and logically develop the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. He states that the symbol of faith against newly-rising errors cannot be drawn up except by him who has the authority of ultimately determining the doctrines of faith, which should be held by all with immoveable belief. But he remarks that this authority belongs to the Roman Pontiff. He proves that the Pope has this authority from two principal reasons: first, according to the ecclesiastical tradition, causes of greater importance and difficulty are referred to him; secondly, the promise made by Christ to Peter (Luke xxii. 32), that his faith should never fail, but that he should confirm his brethren. He goes further into the matter, and he inquires into the reason why Christ made this promise to Peter, and in him to his Successors: he finds it in that dogmatical principle, that the faith of the whole Church should be one. Now, continues he, this cannot be secured unless

[846] *Comm. in Lucam.* xxii. 32 (Op., t. x., p. 326. Lugduni, 1651).
[847] *Comm. in Matt.* xvi. 19 (Op., t. xix., p. 308. Lugduni, 1651).

questions of faith, as they arise, are determined by him who presides over the whole Church: so that his decision receive the firm adherence of the Universal Church. He then again concludes that it belongs to the Roman Pontiff to publish every new form of symbol.[848] In this manner St. Thomas points out the intimate connection between the doctrine of the unity of the Church and that of Papal Infallibility. Moreover, the same holy Doctor, commenting on the words of St. Matthew (xvi. 18), remarks that this is the reason for which, while in other parts of the Catholic world the doctrine of Christ is mixed with many errors, the Church of Peter is fresh in faith, and is kept free from error. And no wonder, he adds, because the Lord said to Peter, "I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not."[849] Thus, the Angelic Doctor proves the same consequence from each of these two passages of the Gospel; and he rests the doctrine of Papal Infallibility on two dogmatical principles—on the perfect unity of faith in the Church, and on its immoveable or indefectible character. Again, the holy Doctor points out in his logical conclusion that the two doctrines of Church Indefectibility and of Papal Infallibility are most closely connected: and therefore he openly declares that whoever should oppose with pertinacity a dogmatical definition of the Pope, should be held as a heretic.[850] Knowing this, we may listen to what "Janus" says on the doctrine of St. Thomas. "It was," he says, "on the

[848] In *Summa*, 2, 2, q. i., art. x., in corpore.

[849] Opusc. vii., *In Symbolum Apostolorum*, art. ix. (Op., t. xvi., p. 148. Parmæ, 1865).

[850] "Si quis tali ordinationi (ordinatæ auctoritate universalis Ecclesiæ) pertinaciter repugnaret, hæreticus censeretur. Quæ quidem auctoritas principaliter residet in summo Pontifice . . . contra cujus auctoritatem nec Hieronymus, nec Augustinus, nec aliquis sacrorum Doctorum suam sententiam defendit" (In *Summa*, 2, 2, q. xi., art. 2, ad 3).

basis of fabrications invented by a Monk (?) of his own Order, including a Canon of Chalcedon giving all the Bishops an unlimited right of appeal to the Pope, and on the forgeries found in Gratian, that St. Thomas built up his Papal system, with its two leading principles, that the Pope is the first infallible teacher of the world, and the absolute ruler of the Church. The spurious Cyril of Alexandria is his favourite author on this subject, and he constantly quotes him."[851] This extract is nothing else than a tissue of falsehoods and calumnies. We have seen what were the authorities on which St. Thomas built up his doctrine on Papal Infallibility. They were nothing but the two Biblical testimonies, containing the promises of Christ our Lord to Peter and his Successors. Now we will add that in the three places just cited, in which St. Thomas explains and scientifically develops the dogma of Papal Infallibility, he does not make the slightest mention either of *any fabrications of a Monk* (?) *of his Order*, or of the spurious Canon of Chalcedon, or of the forgeries of Gratian, or of the apocryphal St. Cyril. It is then an impudent falsehood that the holy Doctor quotes the last-named work constantly on the subject, the truth being that he never quotes it at all in the places cited, where he speaks of Papal Infallibility. In 2, 2, q. 11, a. 10, he does once quote from Gratian the authentic words of Innocent I. in his Epistle to the Council of Milevis. Such is the impostor "Janus," who receives from the enemies of the Church such loud commendations, as being the deepest, most honest, and learned theologian of our age. Such hollow flattery may well be treated with contempt.

Again. The Franciscan, St. Bonaventure—called the Seraphic Doctor—was the glory of his Order, by his learning and his writings. He, no less than St. Thomas,

[851] *The Pope and the Council*, ch. iii., sec. 18, p. 267. Rivington, London.

spoke of the supreme infallible authority of the Pope; and endeavoured to propagate the same belief throughout the world. "If," he says, "in the time of the figurative Priest, it was sin to oppose the decision of the Pontiff, much more in the time of all revealed truth and grace, when it is known that the plenitude of power is given to the Vicar of Christ, is it sin, and in no way to be tolerated, to dogmatise in faith and morals contrary to his definitions, by approving what he reproves, building up again what he destroys, and defending what he condemns."[852] The Seraphic Doctor then maintains that the Pope possesses the plenitude of authority; he is therefore superior to the Council, and his doctrinal definitions are irreformable and infallible. Moreover, he says that it is a sin to resist his definitions, much more than in the Old Covenant it was sin to oppose the decisions of the High Priest. Consequently, St. Bonaventure taught the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff: not only when he expressly stated that the plenitude of authority was given to him, but principally when he declared it to be a sin not to submit interiorly to his decisions; which obligation cannot be understood unless the Pope is infallible in his utterances. The remainder of the Scholastic Theologians down to the Council of Constance, were on this subject of one mind, following in the steps of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure: so that we have no need to prolong this section by producing extracts from their works.[853] The persuasion of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility had grown in the fourteenth century to such an extent, and had become

[852] *Expositio in Reg. FF. Min., Exp. Conf. Regulæ* (Op., t. vii., p. 308. Lugduni, 1668); *Apologia Pauperum Resp.*, cap. i. (l. c., p. 382).

[853] Many extracts of other Scholastics may be found in Bouix, *De Papa*, t. i., prop. lvi., p. 45, seq., and in *Traité sur l'Autorité et l'Infaillibilité des Papes*, ch. xii., p. 324, seq. Luxembourg, 1724.

so universal, that we can openly assert that no one attempted to reject it. And thus the French Clergy in a body, and the University of Paris, in which the most learned men of that age held Chairs, on many an occasion during the fourteenth century bore public and solemn witness to the doctrine. In an address of the French Bishops to Clement IV., when Philip the Fair compelled that Pope to declare Boniface VIII. to have been a heretic, we read the following words: "It is no question here of the heresy of a Pope. For as Pope he (Boniface) could not be heretical, but only as a private person: for never was any Pope a heretic as Pope."[854] Moreover, in 1324, Stephen, Bishop of Paris, with the greatest and the best part of the Professors and Doctors in Theology, confessed that to the Pope, the Vicar of Christ, as to the universal rule of Catholic truth, it belongs to approve doctrines, to resolve doubts, to determine what is to be believed, and to reject errors.[855] But towards the end of that century, the whole University, through Peter d'Ailly, in a declaration of faith presented to the supposed legitimate Pope Clement VII., professed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility as an article of Catholic faith. "Of this See," they say, "in the person of Peter, the Apostle, whose See it is, it was said, 'Peter, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.'" It is then to this See that the determination of faith, and the approbation of Catholic truth, and the condemnation of heretical impiety, above all, belong.[856]

After these evidences, how can any one entertain a doubt that the French Church, from the very beginning up to the Council of Constance, always professed as

[854] *Hist du Differ.*, pp. 399 and 413. In Muzzarelli, *Il buon uso della Logica*, t. i., Opuscolo iii., p. 192, seq. Firenze, 1821.

[855] In D'Argentré, *Coll. Judiciorum*, t. i., p. 222. Paris, 1728.

[856] Penes Sfondrati, *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. iv., sec. ii., p. 776 (Edit. S. Galli, 1702), and Petit Didier, Op. cit., l. c., p. 339.

a dogma of faith the doctrine of Papal Infallibility? Even if any doubt could be still held on this subject, it ought certainly to be dispelled by the testimony of Gerson himself. He expressly asserted that before the celebration of the Council of Constance the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, and of his superiority to the Synod, was so universally maintained, that those who upheld the contrary were suspected of heresy, or were considered guilty of it.[857] Now if it be true—as it is—that the persuasion of Papal Infallibility was universal in the Church in the fifteenth century, not only among laymen, but also among the Clergy, and if it was proclaimed by the Universities, by the Episcopate, and by the Popes themselves, without any contradiction or any protest whatever, how can it be said that it was not an article of Catholic faith? If it was an error, then the Universal Church was in error in the fourteenth century: but to say this would destroy the infallibility of the Universal Church. Consequently, either we must admit the dogma of Papal Infallibility, or we are forced to renounce our belief in the infallibility of the Church.

[857] *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, consid. xii., p. 135 (Op., pt. i. Parisiis, 1606).

SECTION XIV.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AT THE TIME OF THE COUNCILS OF CONSTANCE AND FLORENCE. GALLICANISM.

THE great schism of the West, and the two Councils of Constance and Basle, may be regarded as the immediate cause of the erroneous opinion which exists, denying the Infallibility of the Pope and his superiority over General Councils. We know well that since the thirteenth century, Pagan maxims opposed to ecclesiastical independence had begun to spread all over Europe; Cæsarism and Ghibellinism, with their schismatical principles, were everywhere effectually propagated by the new jurisprudence and its supporters. The first effect of these maxims was to overthrow the idea of the civil preponderance of the Church and of the Popes, and to dispose the people to curtail or totally to reject their spiritual authority, upon false pretexts of liberty, independence, and nationality. The Western schism contributed in two ways to the propagation of these fatal principles: first by letting the majesty of the Roman Pontiff fall into contempt; and secondly, by depriving the nations of the protection of his influence, constantly directed to checking the new and dangerous system of licentious freedom which was spreading far and wide. The desire of putting an end to the long and ruinous schism unfortunately gave rise to two distinct factions, which, though differing in their systematical views, still agreed in the principle of putting some restraint on the Supreme Ruler of the

Church, and of limiting his authority. Of the two factions, that which was the more moderate, although no less hostile to the Papacy than the other, was the party which, represented and headed by Gerson and D'Ailly, was so influential in the Council of Constance.[858] One of the fundamental errors of this faction was, that they applied to the normal state of the Church a theory which was only adapted to the particular and transitory state of schism. But in another part of this work we have already set forth the origin and true aspect of this important series of events; we will therefore avoid repeating here what was there exhibited at length, and we refer our readers to the former discussion.[859]

As to the Council of Constance, Mgr. Maret devotes no less than three chapters to an unwise attempt to prove not only the Ecumenical character of the Sessions which preceded the election of the new Pope Martin V., but also the authority of the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions, regarding the superiority of the General Council to the Pope.[860] In the place referred to above, we have proved that the Council of Pisa and that of Constance were not, properly speaking, Ecumenical Synods, but General Assemblies of the governing portion of the Church, which had no other authority than that of ascertaining and declaring the legitimate Pope, whom all were to obey, and of reinstating the Church in its normal position. When they had fulfilled this duty, they ceased to have any legal authority, unless so far as they might be sanctioned by the new Pontiff, and presided over by him or his Legates. Now the Council of Constance did not elect the new Pope before the Forty-first Session. Consequently, up to this

[858] See *Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. vii., p. 160, seq.

[859] L. c.

[860] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., chs. v., vi., vii., t. i., pp. 386, 406, 427, seq.

time (1.) the Council of Constance was not properly a Council, either general or particular. Because a General Council, empowered to exercise its ruling authority over the whole Church, must represent the governing part of the Church in its normal state, and in its intimate conjunction with its visible Head; (2.) any decree whatever enacted by that Synod concerning faith and discipline made before the Forty-first Session had no other authority except that of mere schemes representing the wish of a large number of Bishops, which became laws only when made valid and sanctioned by the new Pope. The only decrees then, in which the Council exercised its power, were such as concerned the fittest means of restoring personal unity in the headship of the Church. Again, it is idle to insist upon the convocation and confirmation of the Council by Pope John XXIII., as is done by Mgr. Maret.[861] A Pope whose authority is openly disputed, and in time of schism, cannot give authority to an Ecumenical Council, and enable it to act according to its normal institution. In such a case of uncertainty and schism, the Bishops are first to meet, with or without convocation, in order to dispel the doubts which hinder the recognition of the true Pope by the true Church; but when discharging this task they need no sanction or confirmation from any of the doubtful Popes. Hence regarding the Council of Constance, the only question which can be mooted is, whether Martin V. confirmed all the acts of that Synod, and gave them final validity.

Now it is clear that Martin V., in the Bull *Inter cunctas*,[862] sanctioned only the condemnation of the heresies of Wycliffe and Huss. But, it is urged, he mentioned that the General Council of Constance had pronounced against these heretics a sentence of condem-

[861] *Du Concile Général*, ch. v., n. v., p. 395, seq.

[862] In Act. Conc. Constant. (Labbe, t. xvi., p. 751, seq.).

nation. Hence Mgr. Maret and the Gallican party conclude that the Pope acknowledged as Ecumenical the Sessions which were devoted to the examination of the heretical doctrine, and consequently also the Fourth and Fifth, since the authority of the Council of Constance is indivisible.[863] We answer that when Martin V. mentions the condemnation passed by the General Council of Constance, he intends no more than to point out as a fact that the General Assembly of all the Catholic Bishops who met in Constance had agreed on the heterodoxy of Wycliffe and Huss; but this does not necessarily imply that that Assembly, when passing sentence of condemnation against these heresies, constituted a Council, properly speaking Ecumenical. Moreover, in the questions inserted in that Bull, which were to be addressed to those who returned from heresy, the Pope does not say in what Sessions the Council of Constance was truly Ecumenical; but he only intimates that it must be regarded as Ecumenical. Of course this is to be understood of the acts, which the Pope himself had confirmed in the Council itself, while it was under the leadership of the newly-elected Pope.[864]

But even if the Council of Constance were to be regarded as Ecumenical from the very first Session, it would not follow that the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions are to be looked upon as confirmed by Martin V. with the meaning attributed to them by the Gerson faction. They are not mentioned in the Bull *Inter cunctas;* nothing is left, therefore, but to see whether they are included in the oral declaration made by the Pope at the end of the Council. In that declaration, which was communicated to the whole Synod, the Pontiff said that "omnia et singula determinata,

[863] *Du Concile Général,* l. iii., ch. v., n. vi., p. 398, seq.

[864] In Bulla *Inter cunctas.* In Actis Conc. Constant. (Labbe, t. xvi., p. 760, seq.).

conclusa, et decreta in materiis fidei per præsens Concilium conciliariter, tenere et inviolabiliter observare volebat, et nunquam contraire quoque modo."[865] Now it is evident that the synodical Constitutions published in the Fifth Session have not the character required by Pope Martin V., since, as we have already said, during these Sessions the Council of Constance was not, properly speaking, a Council. But we will not lengthen this section by treating over again a subject which we have discussed at some length in another work;[866] especially as such a repetition is no way necessary for our main purpose.

Mgr. Maret appeals to the Council of Constance as being the best interpreter of its own Acts, and again, he appeals to Pope Martin V., and thinks that both the Council and the Pope approved the decree of the Fifth Session, and the view that they concerned the normal state of the Church.[867] Since then there is no authority more pleasing to Mgr. Maret than the Acts of the Council and of Pope Martin V., we accept the challenge. But, as we have already treated this question elsewhere,[868] we will deal with it as briefly as possible, and so far only as is needed to show the weakness of Mgr. Maret's arguments. We maintain then, that although the Gerson faction in the Synod had supported the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions as leading principles of the normal Constitution of the Church, still the majority of the Council regarded them only as synodical Constitutions concerning a time of schism and uncertainty with regard to the person of the legitimate Pontiff. In fact, when in the Thirty-eighth

[865] Sess. xlv. In Act. Conc. Const. (Labbe, l. c., p. 746).

[866] *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. viii., p. 184, seq.

[867] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. vii., t. i., p. 427, seq.; ch. vi., n. ix., p. 420.

[868] *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. viii., p. 189, seq.

Session a scheme of law was drawn up for the reform of the discipline of the Church, the German nation proposed that, should the Pope about to be chosen neglect to enforce the decrees of reform before his coronation, the decree of his election should be annulled. Now, what was the answer of the Council? The Assembly, with almost absolute unanimity, rejected the proposal on the ground that "the Pope, once elected, could not be bound."[869] On this account no penal sanction was inserted in the decree of reformation, because it concerned the legitimate Pontiff then about to be elected. The same course was adopted with respect to the Synods which were to be assembled by the new Pope.[870] So that the famous *Frequens*, on which Mgr. Maret has insisted so strongly, is a proof that the Synod of Constance would not venture to threaten with ecclesiastical punishment a legitimate Pope who should refuse to call a new Council at the fixed time. Consequently, the Council claimed no authority over the Pope. It is clear that if Martin V. declared that he would execute the decree of the Synod regarding the convocation of a new Council, he did not regard himself bound to submit to that decree as to a law of a superior, but as to the advice of his brethren, who were anxious that the Head of the Church should profit by their experience and by their learning, for the general administration of the Church.[871]

But a striking difference exists between the form of these decrees regarding the new legitimate Pope who was immediately to be chosen, and the laws enacted against uncertain and conflicting Popes in case of a new schism. The Council ordered the severest punishments

[869] Conc. Constant., Sess. xxxviii. (Labbe, t. xvi., pp. 694, 695). "Electus non potest ligari."

[870] Sess. xl. (l. c., p. 706, seq.); Sess. xxxix. (l. c., p. 700).

[871] Sess. xliv. (Labbe, l. c., p. 742).

against such as in time of schism should neglect to call a General Synod as soon as they became aware that personal unity of the Head in no other way could easily be restored to the Church.[872] The Synod exercises a coercive power with doubtful Pontiffs, but does not dare to claim it over legitimate Popes. This shows clearly what was the state of the Church, and who were the Popes that were contemplated in the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions. Nevertheless, the great blow struck against the authority of these two above-mentioned Sessions is found in that solemn condemnation of appeals from the decisions of the Pope to a future General Council. This was pronounced by Martin V. in a Constitution promulgated in a General Session of the same Council.

Hardt, in his Summary of the Acts of Constance, informs us that Martin V. publicly condemned the appeal of the Polish ambassadors from the decisions of the Roman Pontiff to the future Council.[873] Gerson himself has preserved to us the very words of the Bull by which the condemnation was expressed;[874] and he wrote a book against it, and pointedly asserted that Martin's condemnation would entirely overthrow the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions.[875] And really the point is evident. In fact (1.) Pope Martin, in his Constitution, expressly contemplated causes of faith; and the question proposed by the Polish ambassadors concerned a cause

[872] Sess. xxxix. (l. c., pp. 701, 702).

[873] *Fasti Concilii Constantiensis*, an. 1418, Martii mense (Labbe, t. xvi., p. 1482).

[874] "Nulli fas est a supremo judice, videlicet Apostolica Sede seu Romano Pontifice Jesus Christi vicario in terris appellare aut illius judicium in causis fidei (quæ tanquam majores ad ipsum et Sedem Apostolicam deferendæ sunt) declinare" (*Tract. Quomodo et an liceat in causis fidei a Summo Pontifice appellare.* Op., t. i., p. 431).

[875] *Ibid.*, p. 431, seq.

of faith. (2.) This Pope termed the Sovereign Pontiff the Supreme Judge in the Church in those causes of faith; (3.) he pointedly declared that all causes of this kind should be referred to the Roman Pontiff; (4.) he asserted that there is no appeal from the tribunal of the Pope to that of the Council; and (5.) he inculcated the great doctrine, till then universally taught in the Church, that no one could reject the Papal judgment passed in such causes. Now after this solemn declaration, we cannot but consider it foolish still to maintain that Pope Martin V. sanctioned the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions in the sense of Mgr. Maret and of the Gallican School.

Nevertheless, Mgr. Maret has the courage to pass over this most important act of Pope Martin V. in the Council of Constance. "Nous n'avons pas cru devoir nous arrêter à une objection contre ces décrets tirée d'une bulle donnéé, dit-on, par Martin V. à la fin du concile de Constance, et par laquelle il aurait interdit d'appeller du Pape au concile général."[876] Mgr. Maret is aware of the plain testimony of Gerson, who was present at the Council, and who wrote a book against the Constitution of Pope Martin. He must also be aware of the plain assertion made by the Chancellor, that the Constitution was published in a public Session of the Council of Constance on the 15th of March.[877] How then could he represent as questionable the existence of that Constitution, and maintain that it was never published? No writer has ever suspected that Gerson in this work was fighting a phantom or a ghost. This denial shows more zeal than discretion in Mgr.

[876] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. vii., n. vii., t. i., p. 432.

[877] "Arguitur quod sic auctoritate SS. D. N. Martini Papæ V., in sua Constitutione ad perpetuam rei memoriam facta et promulgata in Concistorio generali celebrato Constantiæ Idus Martii, pontificatus sui anno i."

Maret. But let us suppose for a moment the truth of what Mgr. Maret asserts, that Pope Martin V. sanctioned the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Synod of Constance, and moreover that he regarded them as referring to the normal state of the Church. In this supposition, the controversy whether the General Synod was superior to the Pope would have been authentically settled. But then it is unaccountable that Cardinal d'Ailly in his treatise *De Ecclesiæ atque Cardinalium Potestate*, written after the Council of Constance, expressly leaves this controversy to the future decision of an Ecumenical Council.[878] This proves to demonstration that Martin V. did not at all countenance these decisions; and the controversy therefore was still unsettled in the eyes of the Gerson faction. But how could Martin V. confirm with his authority decrees which, as understood by Mgr. Maret and the Gallican School, were nothing but an offspring of a scandalous faction, which by their erroneous principles had struck at the very root of the Catholic system? How could Martin V. sanction a doctrine which before the Council of Constance was universally regarded as erroneous and heretical? Is Mgr. Maret unaware that what the Church in one age universally believes to be true cannot in another be disproved or defined as false? What ground then have he and his School to rest upon? Were they logical, they ought to adopt the maxims of Gerson and D'Ailly on the Constitution of the Church and of the Papacy. And yet we know that the works of Gerson and D'Ailly supplied Luther and all the other Reformers with weapons in their attack upon the

[878] "Quæ tamen non definitive determinando, sed doctrinaliter suadendo posita sunt: nam hujus rei definitionem sacri Concilii determinationi submitto" (D'Ailly, *De Ecclesiæ et Cardinalium Potestate*, cap. iv., p. iii. Inter Gersonis Opp., pt. i., p. 934. Edit. cit.).

Papacy.[879] These were the first authors of that system and of that School, which, to the dishonour of a great nation, has received the name of Gallican.

But Mgr. Maret and his friends appeal to the Council of Basle, and this with a double object. First, to prove the authority of the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Constance, which were confirmed by the Fathers of Basle in the sense of Gerson's party; secondly, to show that Pope Eugenius IV. erred in a matter closely connected with faith. Mgr. Maret maintains that "il est évident du moins que dans ces seize Sessions (of the Synod of Basle) il ne peut rien y avoir de contraire à la foi, à la morale Chrétienne, au véritable intérêt de l'Église."[880] Moreover, with regard to the Pope, he asserts that "le Pape Eugène s'est mis avec lui-même dans une contradiction aussi éclatante et aussi palpable que celle où était tombé le Pape Vigile, et dans une question qui touchait d'une manière aussi directe et aussi immédiate à la foi que celle des Trois Chapitres."[881] These two assertions of the Bishop of Sura are two mistakes into which he has been led by his reliance upon Bossuet[882] and De la Luzerne.[883] But as to the first point, after what Orsi,[884] Mansi,[885] and others

[879] Bouix in his recent work, *De Papa* (pt. ii., cap. vi., sec. 3, 4, t. i., pp. 464—494), exhibited an excellent sketch of the enormous errors and heresies to which Gerson and D'Ailly gave manifest support in their works. Whoever reads his exposure of these men cannot abstain from thinking that they were truly the forerunners of the Protestant sectarians.

[880] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. x., n. ii., t. i., p. 460.

[881] *Ibid.*, l. c., p. 459.

[882] *Def. Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, l. x., capp. i.—ix., t. ii., pp. 64—82.

[883] *Sur la Déclaration de l'Assemblée du Clergé de France*, pt. iii., ch. xxxi., pp. 347—377. Paris, 1843.

[884] *De R. Pont. Potestate*, l. vi., capp. i.—ix., pp. 1—55.

[885] *Animadversiones in Hist. Eccl. Nat. Alexandri*, in diss. viii., sæc. xv., t. xviii., p. 537, seq. Edit. Bingii, 1790.

have written on the subject, Mgr. Maret is inexcusable. If he had read no more than the answer of Turrecremata to the ambassadors sent by the pretended Council of Basle to the Synod of Florence, he would have seen the groundlessness of his remarks. His arguments are identical with those employed by the ambassadors.[886] The chief point urged is that when Eugenius IV., by his Bull *Dudum Sacrum*, withdrew and cancelled the order for the translation and dissolution of the Synod of Basle, he declared it to have been legitimate from the beginning, and promised to support it with his authority.[887] But Mgr. Maret first does not distinguish what should be distinguished, and what Turrecremata did accurately distinguish in his answer to the Basle assembly. It is one thing to regard a Council as legitimate and canonical in its proceedings, and another to approve and sanction its decrees as implying true doctrines of faith.[888] The pseudo-Synod of Ephesus was legitimate and canonical in its beginning, but, nevertheless, its decrees were erroneous and heretical. The same must be said of the Council of Milan under Pope Liberius (355), which, no less than that of Rimini, deserves to be stigmatised as a *latrocinium*. But, moreover, Mgr. Maret should have noticed the conditions which were absolutely required by Pope Eugenius IV. in his Bull *Dudum*. It is true that he revoked all his Constitutions published against the Council, confirmed its existence as a Council, and declared it legitimate; but all this was granted on the condition that the Synod, on its side, should withdraw and cancel every act or deed directed against his person and the

[886] *Responsio T. A. Turrecremata ad Basileenses in Conc. Florentino*, art. ii., n. 12, seq. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1479, seq.).

[887] See the Bull *Dudum* in the Appendix i. of the Council of Basle, n. lvii. (Labbe, t. xvii., p. 742, seq.).

[888] Turrecremata, l. c.

authority of the Apostolic See; and he declared that any future decree that might hereafter be enacted at Basle against his authority and dignity was to be regarded as null and void. Moreover, he required that his Legates should be admitted to preside over the Council.[889] Now the Fathers of Basle did not comply with these conditions; therefore, according to every principle of law, the Bulls of dissolution retained their virtue, and the Bull *Dudum* did not avail even to render the proceedings of the Synod canonical; much less could it imply any confirmation whatever of the Synod's decrees. But if Eugenius IV. required as an express condition the revocation of all the acts and deeds of the Synod against the authority of the Apostolic See, how can it be said that he approved and confirmed the decrees by which the Fathers of Basle declared a General Council to be superior to the Pope, and bound the Pontiff to obey the orders of the Council, and render to the Bishops an account of his actions; and asserted that he was liable to their coercive power, and to be deposed by them should he resist their absolute will? And yet Mgr. Maret has ventured to maintain these absurdities. He should have known that Turrecremata, in his answer to the ambassadors of Basle in the Council of Florence, declared the decrees of Basle of which we speak to be harsh and scandalous;[890] and, moreover, that the Council of Constance, in its Fourth and Fifth Sessions, did not enact that, in the case of a

[889] "Ita tamen quod præsidentes nostri ad præfati concilii præsidentiam admittantur cum effectu, ac omnia singula contra personam auctoritatem ac libertatem nostram et Sedis Apostolicæ, ac venerabilium fratrum nostrorum S. R. Eccl. Cardinalium in dicto Concilio facta et gesta, per dictum concilium prius omnino tollantur et in pristinum statum reducantur" (Bulla *Dudum*, l. c.).

[890] Turrecremata, *Responsio*, art. i., n. vii. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1434).

legitimate Pope, the Council is superior to him; the new dogma, therefore, was altogether a creation of the Fathers of Basle.[891] This being so, it is impossible to hold that Pope Eugenius acknowledged as valid an act of a nature unheard of in the history of the Catholic Synods, and which was regarded at the time as harsh and scandalous.

But in addition to these considerations, we have positive proofs and witnesses on the subject. Turrecremata, in his *Summa de Ecclesiâ*,[892] informs us that though several ambassadors had been sent to Pope Eugenius by the Synod of Basle, and had repeatedly begged the Pontiff to confirm its synodical decisions, they could never obtain from him any approbation and confirmation whatsoever. And the Cardinal also testified that Eugenius solemnly declared in the Council of Florence that he granted no more than that the Synod of Basle might continue, but never approved its decrees.[893] Moreover, Pope Eugenius himself renewed this declaration in the plainest terms. In a Letter addressed by him to Foscari, Doge of Venice, he says that he would rather give up his dignity and his life itself, than consent that the Apostolic authority should submit to the Council, in opposition to all the principles of Canon Law—a thing which no one of his predecessors had ever done, and which he was not bound to do.[894] In another Letter to his Legates in Germany he again declared that "he would acknowledge the Synod of Basle, but without any detriment to his rights and his dignity, or to the pre-eminence of the Apostolic See

[891] Turrecremata, *Responsio*, art. ii., n. i., seq. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1476, seq.).

[892] *Summa Ecclesiæ*, l. ii., cap. 100.

[893] *Ibid.*, l. c.

[894] In Raynaldo, *Ann.*, an. 1433, n. 19, t. xviii., p. 117. Coloniæ, 1693.

and of the authority which was committed to it, and to those who canonically sit in it.[895] Consequently, the Pope acted in accordance with his own deep and constant persuasion when, in the Bull *Moyses*, published in the Council of Florence, he condemned the proposition which asserts the superiority of the Council to the Pope, declaring it to be contrary to Scripture and Tradition, and a corruption of the true meaning of the decrees of Constance.[896] Finally, when, in the Eighteenth Session of Basle, the decree concerning the superiority of the Council to the Pope was again maintained, the Pontifical Legates not only did not consent to this act, but solemnly protested against it; some only among them gave way, being forced by violence and acting as private persons, hoping, doubtless, by this compliance to gain the right of presiding in the Council, which had been promised to them on this condition.[897] Was Mgr. Maret acquainted with these documents? If so, he knew his argument to be baseless. If he was not aware of them, he ought not to have attempted to pronounce his judgment on so delicate a subject, being destitute of the proper knowledge of the documents bearing on it.

Let us pass now to the other head of censure against Pope Eugenius. Mgr. Maret, led by his usual want of criticism and discrimination, says—"Il n'est pas de blâme et de mépris qu' Eugène ne réverse, dans les Bulles *Inscrutabilis* et *In Arcano*, sur les seize premières Sessions du Concile de Bâle; . il n'est pas de réprobation plus éclatante que celle qu'il prononce. Peu de temps après cependant tout change de face. La bulle

[895] *Epist. Eugenii IV. ad Legatos suos* (Penes Mansi, *Animad.*, l. c., p. 545).

[896] In pt. iii., Act. Conc. Flor. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1202, seq.).

[897] Turrecremata, in *Summa Ecclesiæ*, l. c.; *Responsio ad Basileenses*, art. ii., n. xix. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1480).

Dudum Sacrum abolit les premières et proclame en face de l'Église et du monde la légitimité, la sainteté et par conséquent l'infaillibilité de ce Concile maudit et réprouvé."[898] And he concludes in the same tone of triumph—"Voilà un fait qu'aucune subtilité scholastique ne parviendra à obscurcir." Without needing recourse to "subtilité scholastique" in what is plain by itself, we reply that, as in the cause of Pope Vigilius, so in that of Eugenius IV., the contradiction is only in the fancy of Mgr. Maret. The Pope blamed and condemned the acts of the Synod of Basle so far as they concerned the supreme authority and dignity of the Apostolic See. Mgr. Maret may find proof of this in the two Bulls which he quotes. The Pope complains that the Fathers of Basle indulged their own ill-feelings, instead of applying themselves to the disciplinary reform of the Church, and the suppression of new heresies. In so doing they usurped an authority which was not theirs over the Apostolic See; they dared to impose on the Pope and the Cardinals, decrees which had not been sanctioned by the Apostolic See, and which were opposed to the whole tradition of the Church; they went so far as to threaten the Pope himself with punishment and deposition should he not obey their summons; instead of abolishing scandals they propagated them, instead of extirpating heresies they gave them strength, instead of promoting the unity of the Church by exalting the dignity of the Pontiff, they vilified his authority and originated a new schism.[899] These and no other are the complaints made by

[898] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. x., n. i., t. i., p. 459.

[899] "Cum ex dicta commutatione nonnullæ dissensiones subortæ videantur, ac nonnullas ex dictis causis, quibus ad hujusmodi commutationem seu dissolutionem faciendam principaliter moti sumus aliter jam se habere cognoscamus," etc. (In Bulla *Dudum Sacrum*. Labbe, t. xvii., p. 742).

Eugenius against the Fathers of Basle; and he declares null and void all acts and deeds of the Synod which bore such a character. Nor does he in the Bull *Dudum Sacrum* imply, even indirectly, any approbation of these acts. We have proved that not only he does not give in it the least hint of any sanction of the acts of the Council, but, on the contrary, he insists on the condemnation which he had pronounced in the two Bulls, *Inscrutabilis* and *In Arcano.* For he exacts as an absolutely necessary condition of his acknowledging the legitimacy of the Council, the entire and simple retractation and repeal of all acts which were directed against the authority and dignity of the Apostolic See. Where, then, can we find the "contradiction éclatante et palpable," the existence of which is alleged by Mgr. Maret?

But in the work of the Bishop of Sura we find more than a want of criticism and of full acquaintance with the documents, so essential in all historical inquiry. We meet occasionally proofs of forgetfulness of theological principles hardly to have been expected in the Dean of the Sorbonne. He asserts that the Bull *Dudum*, having declared the legitimacy of the Council of Basle, declared "par conséquent l'infaillibilité" of the Council. Where did the author ever read this doctrine? If it were true, Pope Leo, in acknowledging the legitimacy of the Council of Ephesus, to which he sent his Legates, would have consequently acknowledged its infallibility, and therefore he would have regarded the errors of Eutyches as dogmas of faith. A General Council is not infallible in its decrees of faith nor irreformable in its disciplinary Canons, except when its acts are in perfect accordance with, and in submission to, the Head of the Church; who can correct or rescind or reject them, according to his judgment. The canonical legitimacy of a Council means no more than this: the Bishops meet with the consent

of the Pope, who alone has the authority of calling an Ecumenical Council; they have authority to discuss controversies of faith and discipline, and to frame new Canons, according to the needs of the Church; but, as we said, they always need the supreme sanction of the Pope, in order that these decrees may become irreformable. This is the Catholic doctrine, and had the Dean of the Sorbonne paid attention to it he would not have accused Pope Eugenius IV. of error in faith.

Finally, the withdrawal by the Pope of the two Bulls, *Inscrutabilis* and *In Arcano,* is simply due to ecclesiastical prudence, to avoid new scandals in the Church, and to suppress evils and schisms in their first outset. The Synod of Basle, from its very beginning, deserved not only to be transferred, but also to be dissolved and suppressed. The pride, audacity, and violence of the Bishops against the Apostolic See were unparalleled in the history of the Church. But prudence suggested the application of mild means to reduce these embittered partisans to order, in order that, if possible, the Church might be freed from new dangers and scandals. Nevertheless, the Head of the Church could not make any compromise with error—justice required of him its extirpation. On this account, the suppression of the decrees against the authority and dignity of the Apostolic See, was the condition necessarily imposed on the Synod of Basle before its existence could be tolerated.

The Council of Florence, purified of the corrupted elements of Basle, renewed and displayed the majesty of the old Ecumenical Councils, and outshone by its splendour the schismatic conventicle of Basle. The Roman Pontiff presided at the head of the assembled Fathers of the West and of the East, and these solemnly acknowledged the plenitude of his authority and of his

power in the Universal Church, and frustrated the last efforts of the insolent faction of Basle. Mgr. Maret, with the Gallican School, professes to admit this.[900] But, at the same time, he and his party maintain that the Council of Florence, in its decree on the Papal Supremacy, not only did not recognise in the Pope any superiority to the General Council, but rather indicated his subordination to it and to its laws. This interpretation cannot possibly stand. The Council of Florence says—We define that the holy Apostolic Church and the Roman Pontiff himself have the supremacy in the whole world; that the Roman Pontiff is the Successor of the blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles; that the true Vicar of Christ is the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and the Doctor of all Christians. Moreover, to him, in the person of the blessed Peter, the full power was intrusted by Christ our Lord Himself of feeding, guiding, and ruling the Universal Church. Quemadmodum etiam in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.[901] Now by this decree the Council plainly recognises in the Pope a supreme power, superior over the Ecumenical Council. Mgr. Maret seems to feel great reluctance in admitting this fact. "S'il faut admettre," he says, "la superiorité absolue et illimitée du Pape sur le Concile Général, il est nécessaire aussi d'avouer que la constitution de l'Église

[900] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. xi., n. i., t. i., p. 468, seq.

[901] "Definimus Sanctam Apostolicam Sedem et Rom. Pontificem, in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur" (*Decretum Unionis.* In Sess. xxii., Conc. Florentini. Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1183).

a été changée en l'an de grâce 1439."[902] We have here the assertion that the Florentine decree changed the Constitution of the Church; and this in spite of the admission made by Gerson, who was himself the soul of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Constance, that before his time the opinion touching the superiority of the Council to the Pope was universally regarded as impious and heretical. We have proved, in the preceding section, that the opinion of the superiority of the Synod to the Pope, and of the fallibility of the latter, originated from the Western schism at the time of the Council of Constance, and others before us, as Zaccaria,[903] and, in our own day, Abbé Bouix,[904] have done the same. The authors just referred to, support their opinion by the names of Tapper, Duval, Raynaud, Bannes, D'Aguirre, and others, from whose works they give quotations; while, on the other side, no authority can be produced for the contrary position, and Gerson himself sides with us on this matter. But, besides this, how can it be maintained that the Council of Florence explicitly or even implicitly implied in its decree the superiority of the Council to the Roman Pontiff, when Eugenius IV., in the very Council of Florence, "sacro approbante Concilio," solemnly condemned that doctrine as contrary to Scripture and Tradition, and impious and scandalous?[905] Did the

[902] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. xi., n. v., t. i., p. 476.

[903] *Antifebronius Vindicatus*, diss. v., cap. ii., sec. i., pt. ii., p. 315, seq. (Cæsenæ); *Antifebronio*, diss. ii., cap. x., n. vi., seq., t. ii., p. 254, seq. (Cesena).

[904] *De Papa*, pt. ii., cap. v., t. i., p. 453, seq.

[905] "Ipsas propositiones superius descriptas . . . juxta sensum Basileensium intellectum . . . veluti sacrosanctæ Scripturæ et sanctorum Patrum et ipsius Constantiensis concilii sensui contrarium . . . tanquam impias et scandalosas, nec in manifestam Ecclesiæ Dei scissuram, ac omnis ecclesiastici ordinis et Christiani principatus confusionem tendentes, ipso sacro approbante Concilio

Council of Florence join with the Pope in condemning as impious, scandalous, and schismatic, a doctrine which, in the preceding Session, it had proposed as a part of the Christian revelation?

But we must be blind indeed if we fail to observe the declaration of the Synod, that the Pope received from Christ Himself the full power of feeding, guiding, and ruling the Universal Church. Gallican writers, of their own authority, introduce an exception into these words —*except the General Council.*[906] But is the General Council greater than the Universal Church? If the Pope has full power over the Universal Church, how is it that he becomes inferior to it when he assembles in Council that same Universal Church? He is divinely appointed to feed all, to direct all, to rule all, without any exception or limitation whatever, because his power is full; how, then, can it be that when the representatives of all those who are to be fed, guided, and ruled (they themselves being comprehended in that number), become his feeders, his guides, his rulers, as soon as they meet in a General Assembly? Moreover, the Synod intimates that the Roman Pontiff is not only the true Vicar of Christ and the Head of all the Church, but also the Father and Doctor of all Christians. Here, again, Mgr. Maret and the Gallican School wish to introduce an exception and a limitation—*except when they are assembled in a General Synod.* Their reasoning comes to this: The father is father of his children, and the master is master of his disciples, as long as these do not meet together. If they meet, he becomes their child, their disciple. This is nonsense. The Gallicans in the Catholic Church are as illogical as the Puseyites in

damnamus et reprobamus et damnatas et reprobatas nuntiamus" (Bulla *Moyses.* In Actis Conc. Flor., pt. iii. Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1206).

[906] *Du Concile Général,* l. c., n. vii., p. 477.

the Anglican Establishment. No: Christ our Lord established the Church as a family, of which the Pope is the father; He formed it as a school of faith, in which the Pope is the supreme master. As, then, the father is superior in his family, and over his children, whether divided or united; and the master is superior to his disciples meeting together in his school: so also, the Pope is superior to all the Church, whether scattered all over the world, or united in a General Council. Finally, if the Pope is superior to the Council, and possesses full power over the Church, he must consequently be infallible. Were he not infallible he would be subordinate to the Council, and his definitions would be liable to its censure and correction; if he be not infallible, his authority would not be full, since it would need the sanction of a General Synod before it could impose on the Church a doctrine of faith.

The words of the decree of Florence are so clear that for some time the Gallican School thought it advisable to deny the authority of the Synod, while they admitted that of the Assembly of Basle. The Cardinal of Lorraine declared in the Synod of Trent that the University of Paris did not hold the Synod of Florence as Ecumenical.[907] But they were forced to give up that ground of defence, and the Dominican Natalis Alexander, in a learned dissertation, proved to demonstration the legitimacy of the Council and its authority in the Church.[908] Thereupon the Gallicans had recourse to another means; they misinterpreted the clause of the Decree. But, *Incidit in Scyllam cupiens vitare Charybdim*, says the Latin poet, and the

[907] Pallavicini, *Hist. du Conc. de Trent*, l. xxi., ch. vi., nn. 20, 21, t. iii., p. 335 (Paris, 1845); Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. clxiv., n. lxxiv., t. xxxiii., p. 364 (Paris, 1768).

[908] *Hist. Eccl.*, t. xviii., diss. x., art. i., p. 604. Edit. Mansi, 1790.

proverb now received a fresh fulfilment. The Gallican writers argue that the words "quemadmodum etiam in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur," especially if compared with the Greek text, assert the subordination of the Pope to Councils, and consequently his subjection to the laws which these should enact. This interpretation, originating with De Marca and Bossuet, has been traditional among the Gallicans, and, as we might expect, Mgr. Maret has given it room in his work,[909] and Dr. Döllinger also produced it in his recent letter against the petition of the Bishops to the Pope in favour of the definition of Papal Infallibility. These writers assert that the Greek text must be rendered by "secundum eum modum qui et in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur," and they maintain that the words of the Latin text must also be understood in the same manner. Dr. Döllinger goes so far as to add that the particle *etiam* in the Latin text is a forgery of Abraham Bartholomeus. To begin from this last assertion, we must remark that the *etiam* is found in all the most ancient manuscripts in which the Acts of the Synod of Florence are preserved, as well in the Vatican library as in those of Florence, Bologna, and Paris. Moreover, the very particle is found in the two authentic copies of the Act of Union kept in the archives of the Vatican and in the Laurentian library of Florence,[910] in which are to be seen the autographs of Pope Eugenius IV. and of the Emperor Palœologus:

[909] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. xi., n. xiv., t. i., p. 488, seq.

[910] See the *Civiltà Cattolica*, vol. ix., series vii., p. 397, seq. The writer, while refuting the baseless assertions of Dr. Döllinger, produces fac-similes of the clause from manuscript copies in the Vatican library. See also the learned letter written by Canon Cecconi on the subject, and inserted in the *Armonia* of Turin on February 1, 1870.

and, in that of Florence, together with the signatures of all the Bishops, Greek and Latin. This is enough to dispose of the baseless assertion of Dr. Döllinger.

As to the main point in question, we add only a few remarks.[911] (1.) The text of the decree accepted by the Greeks was the Latin,[912] wherefore the passage is to be explained from this. (2.) If the clause be taken in the Gallican meaning, the decree would be in contradiction with itself, and would in this clause upset what it had declared in the foregoing part. (3.) The Greek text is a literal translation of the Latin, and if the καθ'ὃν τρόπον καί is simply compared with the "quemadmodum etiam" the meaning will be seen to be the same.[913] (4.) Finally, the Acts of the Council clearly show what was the meaning of the clause in question. Before the Greeks had fully accepted the decree worded by the Latins, the Provincial of the Dominicans was commissioned publicly to explain every clause. Now the Greek Acts of the Council say that he "auctoritatibus canonum, legum et epistolarum sua dicta confirmavit," and this is evident from the speech as preserved in the Latin Acts.[914] In accordance with this, Cardinal Julian, in his relation to Pope Eugenius, states that the Greeks

[911] See the observations on the matter in the preceding volume, *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. viii., p. 204, seq.

[912] Acta Lat. Conc. Florentini, coll. xxxi. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1177).

[913] Mgr. Maret himself is forced to confess that in some copies preserved at Paris the particle ἐν is wanting in the second member of the sentence, and that a Greek scholar assured him that in that case the particle καί cannot have any other meaning than that of the Latin *etiam* (*Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. xii., nota, t. i., p. 489, seq.).

[914] Acta Græco-Latina Conc. Florentini, Sess. xxv. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 510). In the Latin Acts the speech of the Dominican Provincial is given at length in Collat. xxii. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1152, seq.).

"auditis sacris Scripturis et sacris Conciliis visa est veritas, quod Sedes Apostolica et Romanus Pontifex est Successor Petri; deinde, disponente divina Providentia factum est, ut assenserint Græci secundum schedulam datam per Latinos."[915] The Greeks therefore were convinced, not only from the Scripture, but also from the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils, that the Pope was divinely intrusted with the authority which the formula of definition acknowledged in him. Therefore the clause meant no more than that the Scripture, and also, *etiam*, the Acts of Synods confirmed the truth of the power committed by Christ to the Roman Pontiff, in accordance with what had been proved to the Greek Bishops. In the Latin formula handed to them the clause was as follows—"Quemadmodum definiunt Scripturæ sacræ et dicta sanctorum." In its stead, at their request, the Latins substituted that which we are examining, and it certainly exhibits a more decisive authority, since the Ecumenical Councils represent the whole Church. But the Acts of Florence give not even the least hint whatever, on the part either of the Greeks or of the Latins, of submitting the Papal authority to the Council and its decrees. This interpretation of. the clause in question is a mere conjecture of the Gallican School, intended to help them over an insurmountable difficulty.

The fact is that the decree of Florence entirely overthrew the errors propagated by Gerson and D'Ailly, and countenanced by the Synod of Basle. The doctrine of the authority of the Roman Pontiff as superior to the General Council, and as infallible in teaching, was a necessary logical consequence which every one was forced to draw from the words of the Act of Union. This is the true reason for which, while the errors of Basle were kept in abeyance, the contrary doctrines were more and more authoritatively developed and

[915] L. c., p. 1177.

propagated as articles of faith. This was principally due to the authentic declaration of the truth put forth by the Roman Pontiffs, by the Bishops, and by the great Universities taken as a body. In fact, Sixtus IV., in 1479, following in the steps of his predecessors, condemned as scandalous and heretical the proposition of Peter de Osma, in which it was asserted that the Church of the City of Rome can err.[916] The Archbishop of Toledo, after a long examination of this, as well as of other erroneous propositions of Peter, with the unanimous consent of the best theologians of that age in Spain, had already pronounced sentence against him, and had condemned his errors as heresies. Sixtus IV. entirely confirmed the condemnation pronounced by the Archbishop, and sanctioned the terms in which he had censured the above-mentioned propositions.[917] The history of this cause proves how deep the persuasion was in that age that the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Apostolic See, and consequently of the Pope, was an article of faith which no one could reject. And no wonder, when as early as 1351, Clement VI., in his instructions sent to the Armenian Patriarch, had expressly declared that "whatsoever the Roman Pontiff, by the authority of the keys intrusted to him by Christ, determines to be true, is true and Catholic; and what he determines to be false and heretical, is so to be regarded:" and he laid down the strict obligation for the Faithful to adhere inviolably to the decision of this See.[918]

[916] Prop. 8, "Ecclesia urbis Romæ errare potest." In Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symb. et Defin.*, p. 218. Wirceburgi, 1865.

[917] The documents in the matter have been carefully collected by the learned and industrious Bouix (*De Papa*, sec. ii., cap. vii., t. i., p. 535, seq.); Bull of Sixtus IV. (Labbe, t. xix., p. 378, seq.).

[918] In Raynaldo, *Annal. Eccl.*, an. 1351, n. 3, t. xviii., p. 313. Coloniæ.

Leo X. did not fail solemnly to proclaim the same doctrine of Papal Infallibility. In the Fifth Council of Lateran he explicitly condemned the decrees of Basle against the authority of the Roman Pontiff; and intimated in the most clear and plain manner that the Pope has full power over the General Synods. He asserted also that the Scriptures, the Fathers, the Roman Pontiffs, and the Councils themselves, give full evidence to that truth. The assembled Bishops not only did not object the least to his definition, but they distinctly approved it.[919] Mgr. Maret thinks that "cette nouvelle décision aurait aboli les décrets des Conciles de Constance et de Bâle;"[920] and therefore he endeavours to put the doctrine expressed by Pope Leo in the Bull *Pastor Æternus*, in accordance with the decrees of Basle; but his reconciliation comes to nothing short of maintaining that the superiority of the Pope to the Council is a superiority by which the Pope is bound to adhere to the will of the Council, if expressed by its majority.[921] But what argument can Mgr. Maret bring against the Bull *Exurge Domine* of the same Leo, in which he condemned as heretical Luther's proposition, denying to the Roman Pontiff the authority of making new articles of faith or enacting new laws in the Universal Church?[922] As far as we have observed, Mgr. Maret has not made any remark in his work on this subject. But we can distinctly assert that Leo's decision shows plainly that at the time of the apostasy of Luther the persuasion of the Church was exactly what it had

[919] Concilium Lateranense v., Sess. xi. Bulla *Pastor Æternus* (Labbe, t. xix., p. 967).

[920] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. xii., n. iv., t. i., p. 495.

[921] *Ibid.*, n. v., p. 496, seq.

[922] "Certum est in manu Ecclesiæ aut Papæ prorsus non esse statuere articulos fidei, imo nec leges morum, seu bonorum operum" (In Bulla *Exurge Domine*. Labbe, t. xix., p. 1053).

always practically been: that the Pope has the authority of defining new articles of faith. But this doctrine is identical with asserting Papal Infallibility, of which it is only a different expression. Likewise in Prop. 28, anathematised as heretical by Leo X., Luther maintained that "it is not a heresy to hold a doctrine contrary to what the Pope teaches with a great part of the Church till it has been defined by a General Synod."[923] The Pope, by the condemnation of this proposition, defined the truth of the contrary: that it is sin and heresy to hold doctrines counter to those which are taught by the Pope and a large part of the Church. In this proposition the irreformability of the doctrine defined by the Pope is not to be ascribed to the universal consent of the whole Church, according to the Gallican tenet, because the large part of the Church mentioned in that proposition may be numerically the minority. Its irreformability then is only owing to the infallibility of the Apostolic See, which is *Mater atque Magistra omnium Ecclesiarum*, as the Council of Trent itself, following the steps of the Fourth Lateran, repeatedly termed the Roman Church.[924]

The Popes not only proclaimed in a more definite and explicit language the Infallibility of their teaching, but also they continued after the Council of Trent to exercise their irreformable *magisterium*. Before the Council of Trent had closed its Sessions, Pope Paul IV., in 1555, definitively condemned the Socinian sect, and anathematised their errors in his Constitution *Cum quorundam*,[925] which Clement VIII., afterwards confirmed with his Brief *Dominici gregis* (1603).[926] Four years

[923] L. c.

[924] Sess. xiv., cap. iii., p. 82 (*Conc. Trident.* Lipsiæ, 1842); Sess. xxii., cap. viii., p. 120.

[925] Constit. *Cum quorundam* (In *Bull. R.*, t. vi., p. 322, seq.).

[926] Breve *Dominici gregis* (In *Bullario R.*, t. xii., p. 1, seq.).

after the close of the Synod of Trent, Pius V., in his Bull *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, published a sentence of condemnation against seventy-nine propositions of Baius, and declared them erroneous, heretical, and scandalous.[927] But new agitation and new troubles arising through the conduct of the followers of Baius, Gregory XIII. renewed in 1579 the sentence of Pius in his Bull *Provisionis nostræ*, and sanctioned again the terms in which his predecessors had condemned the new errors.[928] So that Baius, who had already submitted to the condemnation of Pope Pius V., by whom his apology was rejected, was again obliged to make a full recantation of his errors in the presence of the Jesuit Toletus, as Legate of the Apostolic See.[929] His errors were thenceforth everywhere regarded and condemned as heresies, although no Ecumenical Council had pronounced any definition in the matter. The University of Louvain, which in the thirty-two Articles published against Luther in 1554 had openly professed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility,[930] not only surrendered to the definition of the Roman Pontiff in the matter of Baius, but

[927] Bulla *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (In Labbe, t. xxi., p. 611, seq.).

[928] Bulla *Provisionis nostræ* (In Labbe, l. c., p. 610, seq.).

[929] Bergier, *Dict. de Théologie*, t. i., art. Baius, p. 225. Lille, 1844.

[930] Art. xxii.—"Firma fide tenendum est, unam esse in terris veram atque Catholicam Christi Ecclesiam, eamque visibilem, quæ ab Apostolis fundata in hanc usque nostram ætatem perdurans retinet et suscipit quidquid de fide et religione tradidit, tradit et traditura est cathedra Petri, supra quam ita a Christo sponso suo est ædificata, ut in his quæ fidei sunt et religionis errare non possit." Art. xxv.—"Certa fide tenenda sunt non solum quæ Scripturis expresse sunt prodita, sed etiam quæ per traditionem Ecclesiæ Catholicæ credenda accepimus et quæ definita sunt super fidei et morum negotiis, per cathedram Petri vel per Concilia Generalia legitime congregata" (Zaccaria, *Antifebronius Vindicatus*, diss. v., cap. ii., n. 3, t. ii., p. 318).

also drew up a body of doctrines in perfect accord with the Papal decision, which were faithfully followed up by its Professors as well as by those of the University of Douai.[931]

We pass over other condemnations uttered by the Apostolic See on the manifold errors which in that age corrupted the purity of the faith.[932] We limit ourselves to the Jansenistic controversy. Jansenius was set up by the partisans of Baius to give fresh currency to the doctrines of their master, and to restore to life his school. His *Augustinus*, in fact, brought up again the errors of Baius, and gave a false colour to the perverse systems of the Protestant reformers concerning human liberty and the action of divine grace. The profound knowledge which the author seemed to display of the doctrine of St. Augustine upon grace, and his boast that his views were identical with those of the African Doctor, imposed upon many, especially in France, which in a short time swarmed with partisans of the Bishop of Ypres. But the French Bishops soon called the attention of the Apostolic See to the new errors which had begun to be widely spread and deeply rooted among both Clergy and laity; they submitted to the Pontifical tribunal five propositions extracted from the *Augustinus*, that the Pope might pronounce his Apostolical judgment upon them.[933] Innocent X., after a full and careful examination, delivered his final definition in 1653, in his Constitution *Cum occasione*. In it he condemned the five propositions as heretical, ordered all the Faithful to anathematise them from their heart, and threatened all

[931] Bergier, l. c.

[932] See the propositions condemned by Innocent X., Alexander VII., Innocent XI., etc., in Denzinger, *Enchiridion Sym. et Def.*, pp. 315, 317, 320, 323, 333. Edit. cit.

[933] *Episcoporum Galliæ Epistola ad Innocentium X. Papam* (Labbe, t. xxi., p. 1641, seq.).

who should maintain them with the pains decreed against heretics.[934] Alexander VII., in 1665, by his Constitution *Ad sanctam B. Petri sedem*, overthrew the schemes planned by the Jansenists in defence of their doctrines. He defined that the five condemned propositions were contained in the book of Jansenius, in the very meaning in which they were condemned. Moreover, he prescribed a formula to be signed by the partisans of the Bishop of Ypres;[935] and by this formula they were required to take an oath that they rejected and condemned *sincerely* with interior assent (*sincero animo*) the five propositions of the *Augustinus*.[936] The words *sincero animo*, as was explained later by Pope Clement XI., mean that all who use them should profess that they adhere to the decision of the Apostolic See *non ore solum, sed et corde*.[937] That is to say, the Pope, without any Ecumenical Council, anathematises doctrines which in that form had never before been condemned by the Church, and he imposes on all the Faithful a rigorous obligation to submit their mind and believe that to be heretical which he had defined as heretical. If this does not imply Papal Infallibility in dogmatical definitions, we do not know what other meaning to give it. On this account De Marca himself frankly declared that the condemnation of Jansenius rests only on the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.[938] Mgr. Maret does not believe the same; he thinks that the definitive condemnation of

[934] In Labbe, t. xxi., p. 1642, seq.

[935] Constitutio *Regiminis Apostolici*, and the inserted formula in Labbe, t. xxi., p. 1645, seq.

[936] "Quinque propositiones . . . in sensu ab eodem auctore intento, prout illas per dictas Constitutiones Sedes Apostolica damnavit, sincero animo rejicio ac damno, et ita juro" (*Ibid.*, p. 1646).

[937] Clement XI., Constit. *Vineam Domini* (Labbe, t. xxi., p. 1809).

[938] Rapin, *Mémoires*, l. xvi., t. iii., p. 144, nota 1. Paris, 1865.

Jansenism, as well as of Pelagianism, is due to the unanimous consent of the dispersed Church. But evidently the Dean of the Sorbonne is afraid of touching this point of history, no less than he was afraid to touch Pelagianism; for he passes over both with very light treatment. He mentions that "la même unanimité morale se produisit dans l'affaire du Jansénisme" (as in that of Pelagianism);[939] that "les Évêques qui firent une opposition obstinée aux bulles et aux brefs de Alexandre VIII. et de Clément XI. étaient une minorité presque imperceptible par le nombre."[940] But the Clergy of France certainly did not at the time of the Jansenistic controversy agree in the opinion of Mgr. Maret.

Long before this controversy arose, the French Clergy had solemnly and repeatedly proclaimed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, especially in the Assembly of 1625. In the address to the Archbishops and Bishops of the kingdom drawn up in that meeting, they had asserted that "Christ has founded the Church on the Pope, in intrusting him with the keys of Heaven, together with infallibility of the faith, which we have seen endure miraculously immoveable in his Successors unto this day."[941] But besides this, as soon as the Jansenistic controversy arose, the French Clergy applied to the Roman Pontiff as to the Supreme Judge in faith, expecting from him a definitive judgment, without stating their own views on the subject. They declared at the same time that, as at the voice of Christ the winds and the sea obeyed, so at the voice of His Vicar the tempest of error would be calmed. As soon as the final sentence was pronounced by Innocent X., they, in

[939] *Du Concile Général*, l. iii., ch. xiv., n. v., t. i., p. 515.

[940] *Ibid.*, l. c.

[941] In Sfondrati, *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. iv., sec. ii., n. x., p. 780. Edit. cit. This address was not published at the time, for reasons not clearly known.

a letter addressed to the Pope that very same year, 1653, whilst giving vent to their joy at the receipt of the Papal judgment, which had come in time to prevent the evils of the Church, solemnly intimated that "judgments in confirmation of the rule of faith published by the Pontiffs, when consulted by Bishops, rest upon a divine and supreme authority throughout the world; which all Christians are in duty bound to obey with the submission of their mind itself."[942] And they proved their assertion by the examples of the condemnation of the Pelagians by Innocent I. and Zosimus without any General Synod, and that of the Apollinarists and the Macedonians by Damasus, also before any Synod; and concluded by fully acknowledging the justice of the declaration that the pains decreed against heretics should be enforced against those who should venture to resist the definition of the Roman Pontiff. This language is far different from that of Mgr. Maret and his School.

This first letter was followed by three other letters written on the same subject by the French Bishops to Innocent X. and Alexander VIII., in the years 1654, 1656, and 1660. In the first the Prelates declare that the Jansenists by their artifices attempted to take away a part of the old deposit of the faith, the custody of which had been intrusted by Christ to the Chair of St. Peter.[943] In the second they profess to believe that the Decree of Innocent X. was as peremptory as was that of Zosimus against the Pelagians.[944] Finally, in the third letter, addressed to Alexander VII., after having testified their full submission to the decisions of the Apostolic See, they intimate that their strength, the strength of the whole Clergy, was firmly placed in the

[942] Sfrondrati, *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. iv., sec. ii., n. xi., p. 782.

[943] In Zaccaria, *Antifebronio*, diss. v., cap. ii., n. iv., t. ii., p. 323. Cesena.

[944] *Ibid.*, l. c.

Roman Pontiff.[945] But not only did the French Bishops express these sentiments in their addresses to the Supreme Head of the Church, but also they did the same in their circular letters to all the Clergy of the kingdom. In these they strongly recommended a perfect submission to the decisions of the Apostolic See, such submission being an inheritance of the Bishops of France. But yet more clearly in the circular of 1663 they set before the eyes of the Clergy the noble examples of their ancestors: "Alcuin Évêque de Vienne," they say, ". . . écrivant au Pape Hormisdas, l'assure que non seulement l'Église de Vienne, mais aussi toutes celles de France, sont dans une parfaite volonté de suivre tout ce qu'il ordonnerait touchant les matières de foi." And they continue: "C'est le point solide de nôtre gloire, qui rend nôtre foi invincible et notre autorité infaillible, lorsque nous tenons l'une et l'autre inséparablement attachées au centre de la religion, en nous liant au Siége de St. Pierre, pour la créance et pour la discipline dans l'unité de l'esprit de l'Église. . . . Nous espérons plus que jamais une victoire achevée contre l'hérésie jansénienne, puisque le soleil du Vatican a mêlé la plénitude de son jour aux lumières de notre conduite."[946]

These solemn acts prove indisputably that up to 1663 the noble Clergy of that Catholic nation retained the deepest persuasion that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was an article of faith. But if this was at that time the doctrine of France, we must say that the same was then the doctrine of the whole Church. And certainly Suarez, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, testified that all the Catholic Doctors of the time taught that doctrine, which he calls Catholic

[945] Zaccaria, *Antifebronio*, diss. v., cap. ii., n. iv., t. ii., p. 324. Cesena.

[946] D'Argentré, *Coll. Judic.*, t. iii., p. 312. seq.

truth.[947] Nay, De Marca, in 1661, bore witness that the doctrine of the Popes being infallible when speaking *ex cathedrâ* and on matters of faith, was the doctrine of all the Universities of all the provinces of Christendom, except the ancient Sorbonne: that the great majority of the Doctors in France laugh at the contrary opinion of the old Sorbonne, which, he says, is only tolerated by the Church. Nay, he went so far as to say that "nier l'infallibilité du Pape pour les choses spirituelles, c'était se déclarer calviniste;"[948] so certain was it that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was at that time regarded by the Popes and by the Clergy at large as an article of faith. We know well, nor was it the least necessary that Mr. Renouf should remind us, that "the combined weight of all the theologians of that time, as Suarez, Bellarmine, Zaccaria, &c., cannot even tend to make an article of faith."[949] No Catholic theologian can be found who believes otherwise. But this is the reason why, when we find the doctrine of Papal Infallibility explicitly, solemnly, and constantly proclaimed and acted on by the Popes, believed by the Episcopal body, intimated by the Councils, taught by all the theologians of most merit, and upheld by all the Universities, we must necessarily conclude that it is a Catholic, a revealed doctrine, which belongs to the deposit of faith, and which all the sophisms and bitterness of a few misguided writers in our age will not be able to destroy.

[947] *De Fide*, disput. v., sec. viii., n. 4 (In Op., *De Triplici Virtute Theologica*).

[948] *Observationes Petri De Marca super theses Claromontanas* (Op. MM.). See some extracts in Soardi, *De R. Pontificis Auctoritate*, l. i., cap. viii., doc. xii., t. i., p. 207, seq. (Heilderbergæ, 1793); in Sfondrati, Op. cit., l. c., p. 784, seq. See also Rapin, *Mémoires*, t. iii., l. c., p. 144. Baluze informs us that De Marca wrote a dissertation on Papal Infallibility, which was the last work of his life (In *Vita*, p. 40. Edit. Parisiis, 1663).

[949] *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 37, seq.

Now, such being the universal doctrine of the Catholic Church in the seventeenth century, what must we think of the famous Declaration of the Four Articles made by the French Ecclesiastical Assembly in 1682? We can think nothing except that it was a new and a solemn scandal in the Church, a fresh but disguised heresy, which threatened with schism one of the most illustrious nations of the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, the act was not due to the Episcopal body of the kingdom, nor to its better Universities, nor to its most learned theologians. It was due to its Parliaments, already imbued with the maxims of Cæsarism and infidelity, and supported by the Jansenist faction, which was in a more or less open rebellion against the Church. It was due to a Court puffed up with pride and ambition, and surrounded with Ministers formed on the maxims of Macchiavelli. We have already elsewhere developed and proved these statements.[950] But the valuable documents published last year by M. Gérin[951] added so great an abundance of illustration to the facts already known from other sources, that their truth is now incontestable. A thesis on the Papal Infallibility published by the Jesuit College of Clermont in 1661 was the pretext which gave rise to a faction which had no root in the Catholic Clergy nor in the Universities of France. The condemnation of that thesis was not pronounced by any Assembly of Bishops, nor by the Professors of the great Universities of France: it was pronounced by the Parliament of Paris, on the ground that it might damage the pretensions of Louis XIV. on the subject of *Regalia.* The French Clergy resisted and protested against the interference of the Parliament with theological doctrines, and the University of Paris

[950] *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. vii., p. 157, seq.

[951] *Recherches Historiques de l'Assemblée du Clergé de France de* 1682. Paris, 1869.

repeatedly refused to insert in its Register the Act of Condemnation; nor did it submit, except to open force and violence. No party had cause to feel pleasure in this result except the Jansenists, who boasted of having gained a triumph.[952]

But both the French Court and the Parliament soon understood that their despotic interference with theological matters would not subdue either the learned Faculty of Theology in Paris, or the illustrious Clergy of the French kingdom; still less would they be able to efface an article of faith from the mind of a great Catholic nation, unless they could give to the decree of the civil power a semblance of ecclesiastical authority. On the other side, a doctrinal declaration sanctioned by the Clergy of a great nation would, they believed, terrify Rome, and bring the Pope to terms of concession to which otherwise he would never consent. These were the reasons for which the famous Assembly of 1682 was convened. But Louis XIV., and Colbert and Le Tellier, his Ministers, did not intend to call upon the Clergy of the kingdom in order to learn from them what was the doctrine to be followed, and believed on the infallible *magisterium* of the Pope and on his superiority to Councils. They intended only to obtain from them an approval of their own doctrinal decrees, that they might the more easily impose them on all the teaching corporations of the kingdom, and by their help resist the authority of Rome and subdue its power. Here we refer our readers to what we have already written on this subject, in the seventh section of the first part of this work, as well as to the documents published by M. Gérin. From these it is proved that the Assembly

[952] Rapin, *Mémoires*, l. xvi., t. iii., p. 138, seq. *Mémoires concernant ce qui s'est passé en la Faculté touchant la thèse* (MS. Colbert. Penes Bouix, *De Papa*, sec. ii., cap. viii., t. i., p. 576, seq.).

did not represent the French Clergy; it comprised only those who, under pressure, would easily surrender to the will of the King; and no one of the great French writers and theologians of that age, with the exception of Bossuet, was allowed to have a seat in it.[953] The four Propositions were the work of Colbert, but they were put into shape by Bossuet, who endeavoured to avoid as far as possible any word whatever which would contradict any doctrine explicitly defined by the Church.[954] As soon as they were signed by the Assembly, a royal decree imposed them upon the whole Clergy of France. Nevertheless, resistance against the royal despotism was the answer everywhere given to the edict. The University of Paris distinguished itself by a courageous refusal to register the edict and submit to it. Acts of intimidation and open force and violence were necessary to bring it to obedience; but these acts, while renewing in France the time of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth of England, were a plain proof that the Declaration of the Four Articles represented the doctrine of the Court and of the Parliament, but not that of the glorious Church of France; and that they had no root whatever on the traditions of the hierarchy.[955] The Bishops themselves who signed the Declaration acted in compliance with the dictates of cowardice and servility; so that De Harlay himself, the Procurator-General of the Kingdom, was forced to testify in a letter to Colbert that, if they were allowed, they would withdraw their signature appended to the Decla-

[953] Gérin, *Recherches Hist. de l'Assemblée du Clergé de France de* 1682, chs. iii.—v., pp. 115—262.

[954] Le Dieu, *Mémoires et Journal sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de Bossuet*, vol. i., p. 8. Paris, 1856.

[955] See Gérin, Op. cit., ch. viii., p. 333, seq., and App. A, B, p. 481, seq., p. 522, seq.

ration.[956] And they in fact sent an act of retractation and submission to Pope Innocent XII., as soon as they understood that the King would not oppose this step.[957] And even Louis XIV. himself, at the persuasion of Innocent XII., abrogated the Edict of 1682.[958] Now, to conclude: an act condemned by seven Popes,[959] and by many Synods and Universities throughout Europe, resisted by the whole nation on which it was violently imposed, solemnly retracted by those who had apparently framed it, and finally abrogated by the King himself, who had been its primary source, ought to remain null and void, and should no longer be mentioned except with shame and execration. Those who still appeal to it, and number it among the glories of the French Catholic nation, either must be ignorant of the history of the Assembly of 1682, and of the purport of its decrees, or must have lost every feeling of religious shame.

[956] In Gérin, Op. cit., ch. viii., p. 355. "La plupart (de l'Assemblée du Clergé) changeraient demain et de bon cœur, si l'on le leur permettait."

[957] Gérin, Op. cit., ch. x., p. 435, seq. See also Fleury, *Anecdotes*, p. 167. Paris, 1807.

[958] See the letter of the King to Innocent XII., with other important documents concerning the abrogation of the Edict of 1682, in Gérin, Op. cit., ch. x., p. 454, seq.

[959] On this matter see *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. vii., p. 179, seq.

SECTION XV.

DOGMATIC CHARACTER OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. ITS OBJECT AND ITS CONDITIONS. CONCLUSION OF THE WORK.

WE have remarked elsewhere that the Apostolic See, whilst repeatedly condemning the Articles of the Declaration of 1682, did not denounce the French Clergy as guilty of schism or heresy.[960] The Roman Congregation assembled at the time by Innocent XI. declared unanimously that "the Gallican Declaration could not be dealt with more moderately than by abstaining from inflicting on it the note of heresy."[961] But this spirit of reserve and moderation, which marked the conduct of the Apostolic See in favour of a Catholic nation, affords no proof that the Gallican Declaration is free from error contrary to the Catholic revealed doctrine. It is strange, therefore, that many in our age believe, or affect to believe, that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is actually an open question, merely because the note of heresy has not been affixed to the contrary proposition. On this subject we must make a few remarks before closing this work.

First, then, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility has been held for many centuries by the Universal Church, and handed down as an article of faith. It has always been professed in the practice of the whole Church since the beginning as a rule of belief, and therefore, even if it

[960] *The Supreme Authority of the Pope*, sec. vii., p. 183.
[961] In Bouix, *De Papa*, pt. ii., sec. ii., cap. xii., t. ii., p. 130.

had no clear foundation in Scripture, it could not be regarded as a free point of doctrine; it must be considered as a Catholic truth placed beyond all controversy, as Suarez distinctly asserts. The consent, practical and theoretical, of the greater part of the Church is equivalent to a definition. It proves evidently that the doctrine belongs to the deposit of faith, and, consequently, that it demands to be believed *de fide divinâ.* But moreover, as we have seen, this doctrine has a solid base in Scripture, and is most closely connected with the Constitution of the Church. An unbroken tradition regards Papal Infallibility as a promise made by Christ our Lord to St. Peter, and in him to his Successors, and therefore the Church for centuries held the belief peacefully, and without interruption by controversy. It necessarily follows that this doctrine is no longer an open question but a Catholic truth, to be believed *de fide divinâ.*

But is it a heresy to teach the contrary? We reply that we may consider a heresy under two points of view; inasmuch as it contradicts a Catholic truth which is certainly contained in the deposit of faith, and inasmuch as it contradicts an authentic definition of the Church. If we consider it under the first aspect the doctrine of Papal fallibility is beyond all doubt a heresy. But if we consider it under the other aspect its heretical character depends upon the form in which the error is expressed. The error would be a heresy if worded in the form in which it was condemned by Sixtus IV.—"The Church of the City of Rome can err." The formula of Hormisdas had already defined that the Church of the City of Rome cannot err, and this formula had been signed by the whole Church. This is confessed by Bossuet himself. Moreover, it would also be a heresy if shaped on the proposition anathematised by Pope Leo X., which we mentioned in the

preceding section. The thesis of Papal Infallibility, as expressed in the fourth proposition of the Gallican Declaration, has not yet been censured as heretical, but whether under that shape or under any other, it has been condemned implicitly and explicitly by the Popes before and after the famous Assembly of 1682, and it has been noted with the severest censures short of heresy by the most learned theologians of the Church. It was condemned by Martin V., Pius II., and Julius II., when they condemned as erroneous and detestable the appeal from the judgment of the Pope to the Ecumenical Council.[962] If the definitions of the Pope could be reformable by the Council they would be liable to its authority, and consequently, in case of error, to appeal from the Papal tribunal to that of the General Synod would be a natural course to follow. Moreover, it was rejected and condemned by all those Popes who rejected and condemned the four propositions of the Assembly of 1682; that is to say, by Innocent XI., Alexander VIII., Innocent XII., Clement XI., Pius VI., and Pius IX.[963] The last-named not only rejected with horror the doctrine of the Gallican Declaration, but also proclaimed in an open and solemn manner the

[962] Martin V. in the Council of Constance, in the place quoted above; Pius II., in the Bull *Exsecrabilis* (In Conc. Mantuano. Labbe, t. xix., p. 259, seq.). This Bull was confirmed by Julius II. in his Bull *Suspecti Regiminis* (In *Bullario Rom.*, t. v., p. 312, seq.).

[963] Innoc. I., in *Resp. ad Epist. Cleri Gall.* (In Sfondrati, *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. i., sec. viii., p. 345); Alexandro VIII., in Bulla *Inter Multiplices* (*Bullarium Rom.*, t. x., p. 38, seq.); Innoc. XII., in *Allocutione Consistoriali*, an. 1682 (*Examen du quatrième Art. de la Déclaration*, p. 170. Paris, 1809); Clem. XI., in Brevi, 15 Jan., 1706 (*Observations sur un Mémoire adressé à l'Episcopat Français*, par Gousset, p. 80. Liége, 1853); Pius VI., in Bulla *Auctorem fidei*, n. 85 (In *Bullar. Rom. Continuatio*, t. ix., p. 395); Pius IX., in Allocut., 17 Dec., 1847 (*Acta Rii IX.*, pt. i., p. 72).

infallibility of the Roman Church and its Pontiffs, whose *magisterium* he declared infallible and irreformable.[964] Finally, Alexander VIII., in a list of thirty-one propositions, which he condemned as scandalous, erroneous, schismatic, bordering on heresy, and heretical respectively, included the following, that "the assertion regarding the Roman Pontiff being superior to the Council, and his infallibility in defining questions of faith, is futile and has been often exploded."[965]

Now, if we compare these condemnations of the Pope's fallibility, and the decrees and definitions bearing on Papal Infallibility, with the universal persuasion of the Church before the Council of Constance, and again after the Synod of Florence down to the time of the Declaration of 1682, we shall be forced to conclude that the opinion of Papal fallibility is in itself not only erroneous but heretical, though not yet authentically declared as such by the Church. It directly contradicts the universal doctrine of the whole Church, which is infallible and irreformable. It has been often objected that the *Penitentiaria*, in its answers of Sept. 14 and of Dec. 13, 1831, declared that those who still held the doctrine of the Fourth Article of the Declaration could be admitted to the Sacrament of Penance and absolved. But they who urge this objection fail to remark (1.) that the Congregation expressly puts as a condition that they should hold that opinion *ex bonâ fide et ex animi persuasione*, and (2.) that the Congregation also declared that the confessor has in his power to refuse absolution in such cases if he "aliter judicet ex circumstantiis in peculiari casu occurrentibus." That is to say, the

[964] In *Epist. Encycl.*, 9 Nov., 1846 (*Acta Pii IX.*, pt. i., p. 10, seq.); In *Epist. Encycl. ad Episc. Italiæ*, 8 Dec., 1849 (*Acta*, p. 209).

[965] Prop. 31, damnatæ 7 Dec., 1690; Prop. 29 (In Denzinger, *Ench.*, p. 345).

Congregation admits that to hold the erroneous opinion is a grievous sin, from which *bona fides* alone can excuse, and consequently that only on account of their *bona fides* can defenders of that error be admitted to sacramental absolution. But in our day, except in the case of a most supine ignorance or of great want in mental power, we cannot easily find many instances of *bona fides*, especially at the present moment, when the Church has solemnly manifested its doctrine by the nearly unanimous voice of all its Bishops, in union and in perfect harmony with the supreme *magisterium* of the Apostolic See. Consequently, even now, irrespective of any proceeding of the Vatican Council now pending, not only is it lawful for any Catholic to condemn the adverse opinion as erroneous, scandalous, proximate to heresy, and heretical in itself, according to the example of the greatest theologians;[966] but it is the duty of every educated Catholic to believe and to profess that it deserves these qualifications. To censure Catholics because they make public this profession of Catholic faith is nothing but intolerable temerity.

But what is the object of Papal Infallibility? Exactly the same as that of Church Infallibility. No reason whatever exists for giving more to one and less to the other. The divine promises, the traditions and the constant practice of the Church, are altogether in favour of this teaching.[967] As to the extension of Church Infallibility, we shall treat it at length in the third part of this work, when we shall have occasion to confirm the doctrine which we have just laid down. Calumnies and

[966] Bouix has given a long list of theologians and of the censures with which they have marked the error of Papal Fallibility (*De Papa*, pt. ii., sec. iv., cap. i., prop. iv., t. ii., pp. 241—253).

[967] In the *Schema* of Papal Infallibility presented to the Vatican Council, its object is declared coextensive with that of Church Infallibility.

sophisms are common in connection with this subject, but they have not sufficient importance to detain us.

What, finally, are the conditions required that a Papal definition may be considered infallible? We reply, in agreement with all the Catholic theologians, that it must be *ex cathedrâ*. Mgr. Maret, and generally, with him, all the enemies of Papal Infallibility, believe that there is here another source of difficulty in the way of the champions of the Pontifical privilege.[968] We do not share their groundless apprehensions. Certainly, the *Chair* of the Popes means nothing but their authentic *magisterium*. Therefore, when we say that the Pope has spoken *ex cathedrâ*, we mean that he has really spoken in his capacity of Universal Doctor and Teacher of the Church, divinely appointed to guide and confirm it in the path of faith. When the Roman Pontiff resolves to grant to the Church some particular rule of faith or morals, it is necessary that the knowledge of his intention should be conveyed into the mind of the Faithful by some of those signs which may suffice to make the inward intention known. First, there are certain solemn formulæ, which are never employed in any Papal utterance except in cases where the Pontiff intends to speak *ex cathedrâ*. When, therefore, he uses these forms, no doubt can exist that he exercises his infallible ministry of Universal Teacher. But, secondly, it is not true that the Pope is bound to observe strictly either those solemn formulæ which are consecrated to the purpose of conveying an infallible decision *ex cathedrâ*, nor even to employ any particular external form in his Missives. It is therefore indifferent whether the Pope, speaking in his capacity of Universal Teacher of the Church, uses the medium of Bull, or Encyclical, or Constitution. There are many Bulls which deal exclu-

[968] *Du Concile Général*, l. iv., ch. iv., n. vi., t. ii., p. 66, seq.; l. iv., ch. xii., p. 210, seq.

sively with matters which no way touch faith, and there are many Encyclicals which are evidently utterances *ex cathedrâ;* such as the *Mirari vos* of Gregory XVI. and the *Quanta cura* of Pius IX.[969] To hold otherwise is to imply that some command has been put upon the Pope to abstain from speaking *ex cathedrâ* except by the medium of a Bull. But who could lay such a command upon him? This point seems evident. Thirdly, what we say of the formulæ employed in Apostolic Letters and of their form must be understood also of the Synods which in old times were always held by the Popes previously to their utterances *ex cathedrâ.* According to the ancient ecclesiastical discipline and practice, Papal definitions *ex cathedrâ* were previously read and examined in Synods of the Bishops, principally of Italy, or at least in the Assembly of the Clergy of the Roman Church.[970] The place of these meetings was later supplied by the Consistories of the Cardinals, where the Popes read the utterances destined to be dispatched to the Universal Church. But no one can maintain that, unless Papal definitions were in ancient times read and examined by the Roman Synod, and in modern times by the Consistory of the Cardinals, they would not be utterances *ex cathedrâ.* Certain solemnities may vary, and have varied, in the Church; but the principle remains always unchangeable, that a Papal decision, in order to be regarded as *ex cathedrâ,* must exhibit some or other unmistakable tokens that the Pope intends to speak in the capacity of Universal Teacher. Fourthly, as was

[969] In this matter we agree perfectly with the view of Dr. Ward, expressed by him especially in his *Thesis* x. *de Infallibilitatis Extensione*, p. 33, seq.

[970] See Coustant, *Epist. RR. PP.*, Præf, n. 33, p. xxxi., seq.; Thomassin, *Diss.* xx. *in Synodum* vi., sec. viii., seq., p. 460; Orsi, *De R. P. Auctoritate*, l. i., cap. xxii., art. ii., sec. i., p. 188, seq. Romæ, 1771.

remarked in our seventh section, the Pope is bound to make a careful examination of the dogmatical question referred to his tribunal before pronouncing his final decision. He is obliged, according to the importance of the controversy, to assemble Congregations, to inquire into the traditions of the Universal Church, as well as of the Church of Rome, and to use other similar precautions, because the Infallibility of the Apostolic See, no less than that of the Church at large, is not the fruit and the effect of a particular revelation but of a particular assistance of the Holy Ghost, intended for the purpose of preserving from error the final decision of the Roman Pontiff in matters which directly or indirectly concern faith and morals. Consequently, the *charisma* of Infallibility is of such a nature that the Holy Ghost on the one hand keeps the will of the Pope right and immoveable in its adhesion as to the revealed truth which is the object of his definition; and, on the other hand, He will never permit that the Pope or the Church, before pronouncing a definition, should not take all necessary means to know the truth and its bearings. But Infallibility does not depend on the observation of these rules of prudence, for it flows from a supernatural assistance, which leads the mind of the Universal Teacher into the path of revealed truth as often as he is to discharge this function of his ministry.[971] Consequently, when the final sentence is pronounced, we are bound to be infallibly sure that the Pope was in full possession of the truth, and this without any private revelation. Finally, that the Pope should speak *ex cathedrâ*, it is not necessary that he should always directly define a doctrine *de fide*, and condemn the

[971] Mgr. Maret seems not to understand that, although the Pope is obliged to take every means to learn the revealed truth, nevertheless, his infallibility has nothing to do with the external means of a theological discussion.

contrary error as a heresy. Should such be the case, we ought to exclude from the list of the utterances *ex cathedrâ*, many Pontifical Bulls published since the Council of Constance, and assert that the Pope speaking *ex cathedrâ* cannot condemn any error with minor censures. Many Papal Bulls, of which the *Auctorem fidei* of Pius VI. is an instance, prove the contrary. At all events, speaking generally, the Church has always understood when the Pope has intended to speak *ex cathedrâ* in matters of faith, and all have submitted to his decisions with the interior assent of their mind. If, in some particular instances, doubt might arise among Catholics as to the intention of the Roman Pontiff, the Church affords various means of removing this uncertainty by authentic declarations.

Before closing our work we must add one remark on the thirteenth chapter of the fourth book of Mgr. Maret's work on the General Council. Mgr. Maret believes that personal holiness is a necessary condition of personal infallibility. It might seem impossible that Mgr. Maret, a Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne, should have fallen into such a mistake. Let us hear him as quoted by Dr. Pusey, who showed himself anxious to enrich his last work with some precious morsels from the French writer.[972] "To render a sinful Pope personally infallible," he says, "God must work a much greater miracle, since this miracle will produce infallibility in the bosom of sin, since this miracle will separate holiness from infallibility, *i.e.*, will bring about an effect without the concurrence of a cause, which seems natural to its evolution. This miracle is, beyond doubt, possible to God; but its effect, the separation of infallibility and holiness, it must be owned, astounds and confounds the reason. Is it not repugnant to reason and to

[972] *Eirenicon*, pt. iii., *Is Healthful Reunion Impossible?* p. 303, seq.

conscience to believe and to affirm that a John XII. was infallible, or that a Benedict IX. was infallible, or that Alexander VI. was infallible?"[973] Therefore, since history informs us that some Popes have been wanting in holiness, Mgr. Maret, and, after him, Dr. Pusey, think proper to conclude that, consequently, Infallibility is not a prerogative of the Roman Pontiffs. Ignorance of the true Constitution of the Church, so common among Anglicans, may account for Dr. Pusey adopting this passage of his Catholic ally; but it is strange that Mgr. Maret should have put forward arguments so weak that, were we not writing in a Protestant country, we should deem them undeserving of any answer.

(1.) Infallibility does not at all require the concurrence of holiness, nor is holiness necessary to its evolution. Holiness is grounded in supernatural charity, from which it draws its life and growth; but infallibility rests on faith, by which it is rendered sure and immoveable. Holiness is a communication of the love of God and of the Spirit of God—"Charitas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum qui datus est nobis" (Rom. v. 5); but infallibility has nothing to do with this, and may well exist without it, as faith may exist without charity. Papal Infallibility, as we said before, implies a double gift; on the one side it regards the Pope's mind, and on the other his will. By the first he apprehends the truth of faith, by the other he most firmly adheres to it, and imposes it in its purity upon the Church: thus discharging his public and solemn ministry of Universal Teacher. St. Augustine, when explaining how the faith of St. Peter was not to fail, according to the prayer of our Lord, says—"Quando rogavit ergo (Christus) ne fides ejus deficeret, quid aliud rogavit, nisi ut haberet *in fide* liberrimam, fortissimam,

[973] *Du Concile Général*, l. iv., ch. xiii., n. vi., t. ii., p. 254.

invictissimam, perseverantissimam voluntatem ?"[974] No other gift was imparted to St. Peter's Successors, in so far as their public and solemn ministry of Universal Teacher in the Church was concerned. But (2.) this will, so firm, immoveable, and constant in faith, is granted by God to the Popes only as often as they are called on to perform their office of Universal Teacher in the Church; whilst holiness is not an intermittent gift, it being the fruit and the progressive evolution and increase of habitual charity. Finally, that firm and invincible will does not even regard the Pope in his private life, but only in his capacity of public and Universal Teacher; and only for the time in which he must exercise this public ministry for the confirmation of his brethren and for the instruction of the Church. The question whether the Pope, as a private person, may sin in faith, and even become a heretic, is altogether different from the question of Papal Infallibility. Among the most zealous supporters of Papal Infallibility, many have admitted that the Pope might fall into heresy, and thereby cease to be Pope, because he would then be cut off from the mystical body of Christ; though all confess that this misfortune has never in fact befallen the Church, and that the providence of God will, it may be hoped, prevent its occurrence. But no more need be said on the gift of Papal Infallibility in so far as it is distinguished from holiness.

And now to conclude. The dogma which we have been treating is not new in the Church, as Protestants and Gallicans so boldly assert in our day. It is remarkable that so great a similarity of principles is found between Mgr. Maret, "Janus," and Dr. Pusey. Mgr. Maret has joined with the others in proclaiming that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is a new dogma in the

[974] *De Correptione et Gratia*, cap. viii., n. 17 (Op., t. ix., p. 926. Migne).

Church, that this doctrine would change the Constitution of the Church, that it is useless, and that it will be a source of great danger, religious and political.[975] He attributes the origin of the doctrine to Gregory VII. and his age;[976] he maintains that Scripture and Tradition are silent on it;[977] he compares the authority of old and modern theologians who defend the dogma with that, not only of Bossuet, but also of Gerson, D'Ailly, Almain, Cusa, Döllinger, and others.[978] Finally, he proposes the "Périodicité Conciliaire" as the only remedy to correct all the evils of the Church, and to give expression and effectual authority to its Constitution.[979] But the work of Mgr. Maret is a repetition of the fallacies of the old Gallican School, so often refuted and so often condemned by the Church. "Janus," besides his countless calumnies and misrepresentations of facts, whilst attacking Papal Infallibility, strikes at the very root of Papal Supremacy, by attributing the supreme authority to forgery and deceit. Döllinger and his School, led by the logic of their principles, have been forced to deny infallibility to the Church, at the same time that they deny it to the Popes. And no wonder; for doctrines implying the fallibility of the Pope and his inferiority to the Council cannot stop short, in their progressive evolutions, of developing the principles of schism and heresy. The history of Jansenism and Febronianism proves this clearly. And this should have made some opponents of Papal Infallibility cautious not to advocate a doctrine which

[975] *Du Concile Général*, l. v., ch. iv., t. ii., p. 356, seq. The title of the whole chapter is "Le Dogme nouveau;" n. vii., p. 376, seq.

[976] *Ibid.*, l. iv., ch. xiii., n. iv., p. 237.

[977] *Ibid.*, passim. See l. v., ch. iv., n. iii., t. ii., p. 362, seq.

[978] *Ibid.*, n. iv., p. 370, seq.

[979] *Ibid.*, ch. v., p. 389, seq.

history shows to have had no other merit than that of creating division and error in the Church, and of reducing the Clergy to the condition of slaves of the State.[980]

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility was delineated in the Old Testament as by a type: but the limited Infallibility of the High Priest became in the New Covenant a distinctive prerogative of the Head of the Church; since it is inseparable from his supreme and universal authority, and is essential to the Constitution of the Church One and Indivisible. The same testimonies of Scripture which so plainly prove the divine Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, prove also to demonstration his Infallibility in matters of faith and morals. Neither was Christian antiquity ignorant of this Papal prerogative: from the beginning the Popes proclaimed it solemnly and most explicitly, and the Church, not only never offered the slightest opposition to their declaration, but also acknowledged it by the most explicit and unanimous consent. The Church always regarded the Pope's tribunal as the supreme tribunal of faith, without control and without appeal; and again it considered a sincere submission to his definitions as an unequivocal mark of orthodoxy. The Church, therefore, always referred to him whatever new errors arose among the Faithful, and held them always as heresies as soon as he condemned them by that censure. The General Councils, from that of Nicæa down to that of Trent, never disregarded his direction; they never omitted to confirm his doctrines and to renew his condemnations: and they afforded the plainest proofs in favour of Papal Infallibility. This doctrine was from the beginning peacefully held in the practice and use of the Church. But when logical development gave it a more scientific form, it was then

[980] See sec. vii. of our *Supreme Authority of the Pope*, p. 170, seq.

still more explicitly and more distinctly professed and inculcated as implicitly at least belonging to Revelation. The great schism of the West, the School of Gerson and D'Ailly, and the Councils of Constance and Basle, originated the erroneous doctrine opposed to Papal Infallibility; but they did not shake it, nor check its progress. Again, the Council of Florence on one side, and on the other, the firmness of the Popes in proclaiming this prerogative and acting in accord with it, overthrew and nullified the principles of Gerson's School: and unanimity in those traditional doctrines was again restored in the whole Church. The documents which we quoted in favour of this constant belief in the old French Church down to 1663 place the fact beyond all possible doubt. The so-called National Assembly of 1682 could not succeed in leading the world to believe that the illustrious French nation did not profess that the dogma of Papal Infallibility as matter of Revelation belongs to faith: but it contributed rather to put the fact in a clearer light. Gallicanism plainly showed itself to be the doctrine of the Court and of the Parliament of France, and the best instrument in their hands to humble the Pope and to enslave the Clergy. And unless it had been moderated by a sincere faith which was deeply rooted in the French nation, it would have developed itself into schism and heresy. But a Catholic reaction, long prepared by the events of the French revolution, arose in France, and everywhere regained the ground once held by the old Gallicans. The French Clergy of every rank have fought generously for the majesty and the infallible authority of the Roman Pontiff. And no wonder. That Catholic nation could not forget its ancient traditions, nor the luminous examples of its ancestors. And, indeed, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility rest not only on the ground of

theology, but also on that of history. It is a logical and an historical doctrine. Surely, like all the great dogmas of the Church, it may have its difficulties, which require explanation; but these vanish away when confronted with the whole mass of ecclesiastical traditions and historical records.

At the present moment, when the whole Church assembled in Ecumenical Council is about to pronounce the solemn definition of the doctrine defended in this work, we have no feelings of rancour towards our Catholic adversaries. Whilst we look with pity and contempt on the Protestant and infidel press, which has so grossly abused the Catholic Church and its champions in the present controversy, we see in our Catholic adversaries the members of the same Body and the children of the same Church. And we cherish the firm persuasion that, when the last word will be pronounced from the Vatican, proclaiming the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, they, together with us and with the whole Church, will unaminously answer with the entire submission of their mind and their heart—"We believe."